The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XL APRIL 1954 NUMBER 2

THE FIELD OF SPEECH, 1953: AN OVERVIEW

Karl R. Wallace

PERSONS identified with the field of speech from time to time in the last twenty-five years have taken a perspective view of the academic area in which they roam. For the most part it has been the rhetoricians who have managed the overviews; they have, however, limited their observations to that part of the farm called rhetoric and public address, with only a swift glance at the rest of the farm. Hoyt Hudson, for example, focused steadily upon the field of rhetoric thirty years ago. His vision was so clear and accurate that Donald Bryant two years ago saw little to do but to modernize the colors, fill in new details, and point out relationships which have developed since Hudson wrote. In searching the pages of *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* one discovers that many persons have, of course, given close thought to the field of speech and its boundaries. Professor Cable's schematic chart of the territory is not without interest, and Professor Woolbert's visualization of the field as a piece of pie, which accompanies his prospectus for a department of speech at the University of Illinois in 1916, is intriguing, not only for its plat of the field, but for its title, "Speech Science and Arts." Other men of stature—O'Neill, Hunt, Weaver, and Winans—from time to time in various contexts have also made similar but briefer observations. Perhaps today it is time to map out the field anew. To try to establish a fresh frame of reference for our field of endeavor may help us to see the unity among diversified interests and parts of the field which most of us as specialists cultivate so intensively that we have little time to give to the rest of the property. In mapping out the field I shall try to avoid using colors which might give special emphasis to one patch of the field at the expense of others.

Karl R. Wallace (Ph.D., Cornell, 1933), President of the Speech Association of America, is Professor of Speech and the Head of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois. This article was delivered as a lecture on July 17, 1953, at the University of Michigan's Summer Speech Conference.

I

In the attempt to describe compactly our educational endeavor, I come up with this: the field of speech is an area of study whose twin aims are to understand the functions, processes, and effects of oral communication and to teach the principles and methods that make the spoken word effective. It is a field populated by persons who are devoted to knowledge and to teaching.

The knowledge, the principles, and methods of the field center on a speaker and all the attendant circumstances which envelope and influence him and his listener. The field recognizes that speaker and listener communicate by way of *speech*—a code, as Professor Weaver states concisely, "made up of visible and audible symbols which one person uses to stir up ideas and feelings in other persons without the use of any means other than voice and visible bodily actions." The essential part of the code is language as it is spoken, both message and meaning. Accordingly, whatever knowledge and materials help in understanding the act of oral communication is of primary concern to the field of speech; and certainly of no less concern is the adapting, translating, and directing such knowledge in ways which make communication more effective.

The act of communication—or more precisely, the chain of events which yield a communicative product recognizable as having a beginning, middle, and end—may take place here and now. The communication may be labeled public speaking, discussion, reading aloud, or acting, and the communicator may be confronting his listeners face to face or may be communicating with an unseen audience: the radio listener, the television spectator, the motion picture audience.

The act of communication may have taken place in the past, and the scholar and the teacher then endeavor to reconstruct the chain of events from the written record, to help a reader in the present to understand and to judge the speaking of yesterday or of 2,000 years ago. The scholar in the field of speech accordingly deals not only with events he himself observes; he deals also with a vast literature, a literature which includes not merely the records of speaking but the writings of critics and theorists who have had their say about the principles and the standards, the methods and the techniques, of oral communication. But whether the person speaking is in the present or in the past, his communication is never permanent; it dies as it is born, and this fact lays a heavy burden upon the historian and the critic in the field.

Analysis of the situations in which speaker and listener face each other has enabled us to recognize more or less distinct areas within the field. The areas, overlapping somewhat, are not rigid; nevertheless, they permit the scholar and the teacher, each concentrating on his special interests, to master segments of knowledge, and to develop new, and often complicated, techniques which in turn lead to the discovery of further information. In the last thirty years in the United States graduate study in the universities has mushroomed; the stack of knowledge has grown horizontally and vertically, until no large department of speech is without courses such as "The Electroacoustics of Speech," "The *Rhetoric* of Aristotle," "Audiometry," and "Stage Lighting." (These offerings are of course no better and no worse than similar courses, limited in scope, in other academic departments. English has its course in "Walt Whitman," geography burgeons forth with "Bioclimatology," physics with "Vacuum Tube Circuits," zoology with "Limnology," and so on.)

The areas within the field of speech are familiar to everyone. Nevertheless, preoccupied with our specialisms, we can afford to look over our terrain occasionally and take new bearings.

One of the larger areas is that of rhetoric, a name that is still honorable among scholars, despite the malodorous

associations that popular opinion has given it during the last 100 years. We know that from the earliest times to the middle of the 19th century, rhetoric was dedicated to the art of persuasion. It observed and systematized the practice of the speaker—and sometimes of the writer—whose aim was to influence the opinions, beliefs, and actions of his fellows. Persons who engage in public speaking and discussion, Aristotle said, do so "either at random or through practice and from acquired habit. Both ways being possible, the subject [of rhetoric] can plainly be handled systematically, for it is possible to inquire the reason why some speakers succeed through practice and others spontaneously; and everyone will at once agree that such an inquiry is the function of an art." Any art within our field derives its source materials similarly. Today Speech makes no systematic inquiry into the art of writers; in the academic world, this is the function of departments of English. Rather, it is concerned with speechmaking of all kinds, with discussion and conference, and with public debate. Yet today rhetoric does more than inquire into the events of persuasive discourse. It also inquires into all oral discourse whose primary aim is to transmit information; it fastens upon the speaker and listener who unite to achieve explanation and understanding.

In recognizing man explaining as well as man persuading, modern rhetoric has added significantly to its territory. Not until the English Renaissance at least did the classical tradition formally pay attention to informative speaking, although preaching had always sought to teach as well as to persuade. The development of the sciences, the accumulations of vast bodies of specialized facts, the multiplication of technical vocabularies, the universal use of the mass media of communication—all forced rhetoric to pay heed to the transmission of knowledge. This is of course revealed in any modern textbook which deals seriously with oral communication.

Perhaps the most significant fact of all is that rhetoric seeks to understand and to teach a full-bodied, fully developed art of speaking. Solidly in line with the best of its tradition, it inquires into all the conditions and processes which make a communicative product and test it. From its heart, rhetoric asks the appropriate questions: What are the sources, materials, and lines of inquiry which led *this* speaker to address *this* audience at *this* time on *this* subject? What led him to select *this* information, *this* argument, *this* mode of persuasion, *this* means of explanation, *this* line of development rather than some other? What determined his manner of presentation—the order, arrangement, and progression of his ideas? Why did he select *these* words and manage them in *this* way? How did he sound, how did he act, and why? What effect did he leave on his hearers? The scope of modern rhetoric, accordingly, embraces whatever is essential to explain, to comprehend, and to criticize a product of oral communication. It scorns any attempt to narrow its province to stylistics and delivery. It keeps company with Plato and Aristotle, Cicero and Quintilian, Thomas Wilson and Francis Bacon, George Campbell and Richard Whately. Its historical scholars may hold colloquy with Ramus and Talaeus, with Richard Sherry and Henry Peacham, and with Delsarte, Steele Mackaye, and their fellow elocutionists, but they view in proper perspective the rhetoric of tropes and figures, the rhetoric of ornamentation and display. And the modern teacher of speech does likewise. Although today's textbooks may not em-

ploy the basic vocabulary of traditional rhetoric, they nevertheless pay respect to the five classical processes: *inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria,* and *pronuntiatio.*

Another area in the field of speech is primarily concerned with the oral communication of literature. Its most common label is *oral interpretation,* a label that is meant to embrace whatever happens when a person translates the language patterns he sees or has "learned" into voice and action and thus aims to communicate meaningfully and effectively to his listener. In a rather narrow sense, one may say that the scholar, critic, and teacher of oral interpretation center attention on *pronuntiatio* or delivery. If we may use a word which was adopted in 18th century England and later caught on in the new world, they owe allegiance to *elocution.* This term, as Parrish says, describes "the movement of the voice in relation to meaning: the proper management of emphasis, pause, word grouping, intonation, and various other subtler and more elusive elements of the speech pattern by which a speaker's meaning is clearly perceived by his hearers." (Like *rhetoric, elocution* as a word has collected bad bed-fellows, for the public has linked both with the shallow thought and exhibitionism of many popular speakers and platform readers of the 19th century.) In its broadest sense, the area of oral interpretation includes whatever knowledge and methods are essential to a person who reads aloud effectively to others.

In either sense, the oral interpreter is a mediator. Sometimes, when he is reading his own creative product, he mediates between himself and his hearers. More often, he is the mediator for an author, and usually the author is one of literary merit. Accordingly, oral interpretation is seriously concerned with literature, with any prose, poetry, and drama which is meant to be read aloud and whose fullest message with all its nuances is realized only by the ear. Hence, the interpreter is to an author what a director and orchestra are to a composer of symphonic music and what director, producer, and actors are to a playwright.

Because of his interest in literature, the character of his production may show some of the qualities of fine art. His experience and that of his audience are doubtless more aesthetic than that of the public speaker and his hearers, or of persons engaged in group discussion. Indeed, the attachment to literature and its aesthetic aspects is reflected in Charlotte Lee's swift description of the area: "Interpretation is the art of communicating to an audience, from the printed page, a work of literary art in its intellectual, emotional, and aesthetic entirety." Accordingly, the scholar and the teacher in the area, as well as the reader, are committed to knowledge about what is to be read and knowledge about the methods and processes necessary to oral presentation. The act of merely uttering the language of literature is not enough. There is the experience of understanding the printed symbols; there is the experience of translating them into oral symbols—into speech—to an audience. For the hearer the one complements the other, and neither is more "basic" than the other.

Another area of speech keenly concerned with face-to-face communication refers to itself by various terms: speech pathology, speech and hearing disorders and defects, speech correction, remedial speech, speech and hearing rehabilitation. Despite the variety of labels, the scholars, teachers, and professional men and women in the area focus on the per-

son who has difficulty in making the sounds of connected speech and who, because of his inadequacy, is handicapped in meeting the everyday demands of social living. He does not manage the motor adjustments of utterance as well as most persons in his chronological and developmental group. If he may be said not to exhibit normal speech, we may assert, with Robert West, that his speech does not show *"average foundations."* The controlling aim of this area, then, is to help such persons to make effective the act of communication by improving the code of speech and its pattern.

The pathologist and the therapist seek knowledge unremittingly, and as rigorously, as scientifically, as they can. Historically the area was first attracted by the symptoms of disordered speech, such as stuttering, and if the physician and surgeon did not intervene, re-education was largely confined to an analysis of incorrect motor habits and to the teaching of correct habits. Today the area is complex and highly specialized. Study is directed towards any and all causes and forces which singly or in combination may help to explain the behavior of the speech-handicapped person. The entire personality structure of the individual claims attention, as well as the anatomy, physiology, and acoustics of the speech mechanism. Diagnosis and therapy are facilitated through standardized tests and measurements; and methodologies of treatment are more and more influenced by experimental research conducted not only by students formally within the area, but in related fields as well. The last fifteen years have seen a similar development in the knowledge and treatment of persons whose handicaps are associated with loss of hearing. In brief, the area has seen its stockpile of knowledge grow until the graduate student, knowing that he cannot master all the information, techniques, and skills of the area must decide to concentrate and specialize. As a result of specialization, the research scholar in acoustics, for example, may see less of the whole field of speech than does the teacher of public address. Yet even he can and often does maintain his identity with the field and with his colleagues who are devoted to the improvement of communication.

Still another recognizable area in the field of speech appears to have developed in part from those elocutionists who became interested in analyzing and minutely describing vocal behavior in terms of pitch, loudness, quality, and time, in part from teachers of vocal music, in part from the Bell family who tried to help the deaf to speak, in part from those linguists who became interested in describing the "units" of speech sound and the structure and patterns of language as spoken, and in part, specifically from the physician, James Rush, who published his *Philosophy of the Human Voice* in 1827. It is apparent that such sources show a common interest in the phenomena—*the physical events*—of speech and hearing and in the mechanism which produces them. This interest as an area of speech is ordinarily referred to as speech science.

The speech scientist likes to take speech into his laboratory where he can best control his investigations. He achieves control and precision by mechanically, visually, and electrically recording the events of speech and of its mechanism, and subjecting them to statistical description. Sometimes study and research are undertaken chiefly to discover knowledge for its own sake, as is also true of the sciences, and only later may insights bring theoretical implications. Sometimes research is de-

signed to test practical methods and techniques which may be used by the speech and hearing therapist or by the teacher whose course aims at improving the voice and articulation of the normal person. The war set off a chain of research into the intelligibility of speech under conditions of noise. The high-speed motion picture camera and color film have added information about the functioning of the vocal cords; color photography, too, has promoted understanding of the organs and structures of articulation. The utility of such work is obvious; equally evident is its relation to oral communication.

Most recently the area of speech science has developed interest in "systems of communication." Without specifying the kinds of systems here, it is illuminating to quote from Warren Weaver's comments on Shannon's *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Weaver points out the three major problems of any communication system, whether it be a human system or an engineering system:

Level A. How accurately can the symbols of communication be transmitted? (The technical problem.)

Level B. How precisely do the transmitted symbols convey the desired meaning? (The semantic problem.)

Level C. How effectively does the received meaning affect conduct in the desired way? (The effectiveness problem.)

Although he may be immediately intrigued with the technical or engineering problem, the speech scientist *knows* that his interest in systems is leading him to the problems of meaning and effectiveness in communication by speech.

The linguistic aspects of speech have also taken shape as an area in the field. The linguists study the behavior of language as it is spoken. They take speech into the laboratory; they take their laboratory to the living language in selected locales over the land. Their monument is the *Linguistic Atlas of America*, still in progress. As scientists, they are interested only in *describing* the events of connected discourse; as teachers, or as sympathizers with teachers who wrestle with standards of pronunciation and of acceptable utterance, they may indulge in cautious prescriptions. In a recent article, Wise and Hirsch remark that in the last quarter century departments of speech have shown increasing interest in both experimental and descriptive phonetics, with the result that "phonetics has made itself useful in speech fundamentals, in speech correction, in the dialectal aspects of drama and interpretation, and in the fruitful newer field of linguistic geography; and it has inevitably led into phonemics and into other aspects of general linguistics."

Both instruction and production in drama and theatre are still associated with departments of speech in many colleges and universities. In some institutions, as we know, theatre is part of the structure in fine arts; occasionally it is found in the department of English, or it lives as a department of its own. Such arrangements suggest that the dominant tone and purpose of instruction and production may differ somewhat from place to place. Theatre may see itself primarily as a fine art, giving emphasis to the empathic experience which distinguishes all fine art, and usually developing a marked professional attitude. Or the theatre may view itself as a highly developed, formal enterprise in communication which compounds speech, action, line, color, and mass, and whose educational mission is to provide firsthand experience with a

living art, on the one hand, and a body of historical and cultural knowledge, on the other. In either emphasis, a play is something to be heard and seen, rather than read.

Wherever education looms uppermost, scholars and teachers in the area are concerned with the advancement of knowledge about the theatre and the application of that knowledge to the manifold methods, processes, and skills essential to the presentation of a play script to an audience. This area deals with dramatic literature and the long history of plays-in-theatres; it draws upon the pictorial (and sometimes musical) arts, selecting and translating materials for the requirements of theatre art; it deals with the methods and techniques needed by the actor, director, producer, scene designer and builder, scene painter, scene lighter, and costumer.

Accordingly, the materials of the area manifestly have much to do with the speaking person who must learn to communicate effectively with others. The actor helps to mediate between playwright and audience, and employs all the resources of speech and action. In the delineation of his role, he speaks to two audiences: his fellow players, and the audience for which the theatre exists. No theatre can live without the actor. The theatre can (and often does) communicate with effect without relying heavily upon spectacle. Indeed, theatrical presentations in "arena style" demonstrate how directly the drama can communicate to an audience without complicated scenery and lighting.

These, then, are the principal areas within the field of speech which accumulate knowledge and direct it towards making oral communication effective in the face-to-face situation. The field also embraces other areas—radio, television, and motion pictures. These center on the person who endeavors to speak effectively to an *unseen* audience, and to the extent that these media of mass communication recognize the centrality of spoken language they are at home in the field and in a department of speech.

The significance and effect of the mass media must not be underrated. In molding public opinion on public questions the impact of radio, television, and motion picture may well be as great as the word spoken face-to-face. In communicating popular information, the radio and television speaker may be doing more to raise the general level of education than the lecturer without benefit of the vacuum tube. In shaping standards of culture, artistic appreciation, and moral conduct, these media doubtless produce greater effect than would the Lyceum and Chautauqua, reborn and brought up to the minute. Their audience is numbered in millions of persons. They can create audiences and meet hearers at their own convenience. Their immediacy has shriveled distance and time.

Despite their significance, we need not here describe them as fully as we have the other areas of speech. Their fundamental knowledge—the principles, methods, and basic skills of oral communication—they share with rhetoric, interpretation, speech science, phonetics, and theatre. In fact, the mass media are to these basic areas of speech what the psychology of personality and the principles of learning are to the art of teaching, what physics is to engineering, what the biological sciences are to medicine. The *specialized* knowledge of their methods and processes is derived from their media—the circumstances of production, the behavior and characteristics of their electrical system of transmission,

the virtues and drawbacks of the camera and microphone, and the nature of their audience.

Their need to hold an audience whose responses can rarely be perceived during communication has stimulated the media to experiment with methods of audience analysis, the testing of attitude and polling of opinion, and the success of specific techniques in securing specific effects. Thus the media have contributed useful information to all the arts of communication.

II

Such is the overview of the field of speech and its areas. I have endeavored to interpret and describe them as accurately and as disinterestedly as I can. If the result be acceptable, it is evident that the field derives its comprehensive rationale from *the act and the art of oral communication.* In communication —if we may follow the leadership of George H. Mead—one person seeks to stimulate another to respond as he is responding. His act is an event having a beginning and end, each determining the other. In the act of speech, he is using symbols, signs, and signals of the spoken language which have acquired meanings sufficiently stable and common to permit communion. An art—and therefore *his* art—is distinguished by habits of production achieved through conscious application of correct methods. In this sense, accordingly, the field of speech and its areas draw their sanction from the act and art of oral communication.

Such a rationale is indeed comprehensive. It is more inclusive than the view that the only common denominator of the field is vocal behavior. In this view, the common ground of the many areas is conceived of as "the movement of the voice in relation to meaning" and involves examining and teaching the processes, techniques, and skills appropriate to the "management" of voice. The view is logical. It recognizes a concrete foundation which the speech scientist and correctionist, the interpreter, and the teacher of theatre readily perceive and respect. Thus it promotes a sense of in-group solidarity.

Nevertheless the view is narrower than it need be. Furthermore, it appears to compartmentalize the act of communication by preserving the old dualism of mind and voice, by regarding vocal behavior as a separate entity, something like a tool or instrument, to be used or cast away, like a hoe or brush.

The rationale of the act and art of communication of course takes vocal behavior within its scope. It also avoids the confusion of mind and instrument, for it points attention to the creative component of any act of communication. By "creative component" I mean simply the inventive, selective, and discriminative functions of the human organism which mark the origin and give direction to any act of connected speech. They are inseparable from the act. Those functions we may not be aware of during non-deliberative, spontaneous utterance, but they assume major roles of the greatest significance in communication that is elaborated and complex. In speechmaking and group discussion, in playmaking and theatre art, in the productions of radio, television, and the cinema, the creative aspects of art (invention, selection, and discrimination) are indispensable to any real understanding, teaching, and criticism.

Scholars and teachers who accept the label "speech" and who see their rationale in this way have a field to cultivate which they all can see. It is good soil, having depth and fertility. Some of them, it is true, may travel farther from the farmhouse than others. But the

travel is not irksome to one who has made it habitual and who is committed to it. His chief satisfactions, after all, come from tilling his own area.

In truth, the title "speech" cannot perfectly cover every course and every activity clustered about it in academic life, any more than "English" or "liberal arts" or "education" embrace all its ramifications. Such words behave like any words in common usage. They have roots, but they also acquire many associations and radiate outwards in many directions.

In focusing primarily upon the act and art of oral communication, the field of speech is distinguished from other academic fields. Its territory is obviously not that of physics, chemistry, and mathematics, although it draws upon acoustics and statistical method. It is not biology, although it levies upon branches of that discipline: physiology, anatomy, and neurology. Likewise, its major aims are not those of psychology, social psychology, and sociology; nevertheless, the knowledge uncovered by these studies the field of speech must try to keep informed about. It cannot deal fully with either the act or the art of communication unless it knows all it can about the behavior of the speaking and listening individual, the behavior of individuals in group situations, the psychology of motives, emotions, and attitudes, the psychology of the speech-handicapped person, and the methods of tests and measurements. Speech, moreover, must be mindful of philology and linguistics, though its special business has nothing directly to do with the historical study of language, literature, and culture. Yet, it must have knowledge of linguistic behavior—of phonetics, linguistic form and structure, syntax and morphology. The field, furthermore, is not that of logic, ethics, or even of semantics; speech seeks to apply knowledge from those studies for the control and improvement of spoken discourse. The field of speech, finally, is not the field of English, although the two fields have some mutual problems. Oral interpretation must deal seriously, sometimes intensively, with literature, although it does not aim to produce literary scholars, or to teach survey, period, or "figure" courses in literature. Public address is deeply interested in the relationships between English as written and English as spoken. The skills of writing and speaking may possibly help each other, and the semantic problems of word symbols concern scholars and teachers in both English and speech. Nevertheless, the business of our field is not the study of literature, its forms, its history, and its criticism; nor is its province the history of the English language, or the teaching of literary writing.

In a sense, of course, the field of speech is something of all such studies. The growth and interdependence of learning precludes strict pigeonholing of knowledge, even for the sake of analysis. The method of Ramus and his mutually exclusive divisions is today unrealistic and absurd, for it not only distorts truth but blocks its discovery. Studies overlap, to the point that the biochemical physicist may not know where he belongs in the academic hierarchy—if indeed he even thinks about it. So speech draws freely upon other disciplines, but it approaches them, not as a poacher but as a respectful borrower. And it fashions its borrowings into new compounds with which it may conduct its own research and scholarship and do its own task of teaching. If speech be a "derivative" field in part, let it be so; it still has its proper duty in the world's work.

III

Implicit in this view of the field of speech are certain aspects we must make explicit. For want of better terms I shall call these aspects of the field its dichotomies, its morality, and its politics. Whether these aspects are *peculiar* to the field may be doubtful, for they present themselves to scholars and teachers in other academic fields. I shall be content, therefore, to assert that at least they are *necessary*, and that every teacher in the field, in whatever area and corner, should regard them as necessary.

One of the major dichotomies which plagues our thought and messes up our vocabulary has already been mentioned in passing. It is the dualism of *body* and *mind*. Other closely related dichotomies are *substance* and *structure, content* and *form*. Speech science and correction have escaped from such concepts, but the humanistic areas of our field still use them uncritically.

Such terms seem to have at least one notion in common: they try to conceive of things and persons, events and phenomena (including human behavior) in terms of *container* and *thing contained*. Or when the notion of *substance* or of *subject matter* is appealed to, there seems to be the idea of something being under and something being over, something that is more "substantial" and "fundamental," and something less substantial, i.e., something ephemeral, less tangible and solid. Such thinking plagues us most when we say of a public speech or a play that "It didn't say much," "It had no content," or "Its subject matter was thin." Like all professors, teachers of speech want their students to say something worth saying in the classroom as well as out, and sometimes they have become vociferous, even acrimonious (as did O'Neill, Hunt, and Sanford many years ago) over ways and means of improving the "content" of speechmaking in the classroom.

The field of speech has now achieved a certain level of maturity, of knowledge and wisdom, and it can afford to commit itself to a theory of human behavior which will avoid such dichotomies. The field of psychology offers us a unit of behavior. It is the pattern of stimulus and response. It is an indivisible pattern, having a beginning and end, tied up inextricably with such functions as attention, selectivity, discrimination (comparison-contrast), generalization, and perception. It is a unit of behavior, moreover, whose activity is impregnated with history, its own and that of the organism: it recalls its past, determines its present, and anticipates its future. As pattern of behavior it is neither substance nor form; it is what it is doing. As this unit of behavior becomes highly complicated and organized, particularly on the level of symbolization in language—in mathematics and the physical sciences, in the language of sound and music, and in the symbols of line, color, and movement—its manifestations take directions which have been structured broadly into what we refer to as the fields of knowledge and learning. If we can accept such a view of behavior, the scholarly world might be able to think more consistently, less confusedly, than it does now. Especially in the humanities and the social sciences would confusion be reduced, because their technical vocabularly for the most part is still the common vocabulary, a system difficult to manage in two or a dozen senses simultaneously.

In our field in particular we need not be badgered by weasel terms. As teachers and critics of creative products in speechmaking, theatre, radio, and television, we

should recognize that the problem of "content" is really one in which exploration, observation, selectivity, and discrimination are at issue if the origin and basis of the product is to have width and depth and scope. One of the teacher's special tasks, accordingly, is to stimulate, to lead and suggest and otherwise develop a habit and a nose for ferreting out whatever may be relevant and useful to the formation of the product. In other words, teacher and student cooperate to develop a kind of modern apparatus of invention applicable to their special creations. At any rate, the field of speech is moving slowly towards an ultimate point of view similar to the one suggested. Possibly the time has come for acceleration.

As for morality in the field of speech, it assumes somewhat different faces in different areas. In speech science and speech correction, the ethics of research and therapy seem clear. The scientist is bound to pursue knowledge wherever the road takes him, and he is bound to observe the rules of the road which his peers in science think proper. The code of the therapist is a pledge to help the handicapped person to come as close to normalcy as conditions allow, and to abide by the standards of knowledge and training his profession believes appropriate. The therapist's code is like the physician's; and in this respect, as we shall see, the therapist is somewhat analogous to the maker of speeches and theatrical creations.

In public address, one can take as a starting point Aristotle's view that public speaking and discussion are socially good. When truth and falsehood, good and evil, have an equal start in the same race, the good and the true will prevail. The Stagirite made his point in these words: "Things that are true and things that are just have a natural tendency to prevail over their opposites, so that if the decisions of the judges are not what they ought to be, the defect must be due to the speakers themselves and they must be blamed accordingly." A faith like this—and this kind of self-evident first axiom we must have—the scholar and teacher must hold fast to. The opposite faith is reflected in one of Plato's more cynical moments when he compared rhetoric to cookery which does as much to spoil food as to improve it. It is an easy faith which holds that the arts of communication are instrumental and therefore unmoral.

Truth is a word I shall use to describe the moment of certainty, or commitment, or decision which signals the resolution of doubt. The decision is revealed verbally as a statement of opinion or value, or as a statement of fact. Accordingly, the arts of speech join in the great social task of determining opinion or fact on any question of public doubt. On this scale and in this sense, truth will prevail.

The teacher of speech makes his contribution to this process by concentrating on the development of the student as a communicator. If he is concerned over the morality as well as the skill of his student, the teacher has two specific aims: to inculcate the *habit of search* and to form the *habit of criticism or evaluation*. He tries to develop habits of exploring the problem at hand as widely and as deeply as the circumstances will permit. The chances of arriving at "truth" are greater through range and depth of exploration than through superficiality of search and exploration. In a field which bears a particularly heavy social and public responsibility towards communication, we can do nothing less.

In addition to the habit of search, moreover, the habit of criticism and

evaluation of productions, of comparing and contrasting, distinguishing fact from opinion, cause from coincidence, will do much, as we already know, to sift for the truth and shake out falsehood and shoddy thinking.

Furthermore, if the arts of speech are to be based on a clean-cut morality, they must decide whether they shall give the emphasis to the *end* or effect of communication, or to its *means*. The arts call for a morality which at least respects the means as well as the end, using the end as a signpost rather than a goal to be achieved at all costs. The doctrine that the end justifies the means appears to have caught on widely in recent years —and indeed the cult of success in American life has always led to temptation. Possibly no phase of applied social psychology has had wider appeal in the last twenty years than that devoted to techniques of testing the effects of salesmanship, political or commercial. Implicit in its application is the old saw of the political hack, "Find out what the audience wants and give it to them."

A theory of persuasion which calls for a man's always hitting his mark and losing success and prestige if he doesn't, is indefensible in any free society. If it does nothing else, it gradually undermines confidence, and with confidence gone there is nothing left except for dog to eat dog. There is a better view, especially for teachers of communication. We can appeal to Aristotle, who in speaking of the goals of speechmaking said: "Its function is not simply to succeed in persuading, but rather to discover the means of coming as near such success as the circumstances of each particular case allow. In this it resembles all other arts. For example, it is not the function of medicine simply to make a man quite healthy, but to put him as far as may be on the road to health; it is possible to give excellent treatment even to those who can never enjoy sound health."

Accordingly, what we can expect of a creator is, first, that he have the knowledge and skill which his own kind in whatever art shall declare as the proper standard of competence. We shall expect, secondly, that he will live up to the standards of his art by doing in every case the best possible job he is capable of. More often than not he will achieve success; the means will take care of the end. If on the other hand we reserve our plaudits only for the man who secures the vote, we encourage two evils: we place temptation in the way of the sincere and earnest man; and we give a premium to the man with a compulsive drive. Mix nine-tenths of ability and skill with one-tenth of chicanery and you have an infallible recipe for a communicative product which is marked with something less than integrity.

Perhaps it would not be strange to mention the politics of the field of speech if one were to think only of rhetoric. For example, one recalls Francis Bacon's observation that rhetoric stands between ethics and politics, participating of both. But the field as a whole, as we have sketched it, has a political responsibility to a society which, among other things, has always stood fast for freedom of thought and discussion. Accordingly, I shall assert that perhaps no field of learning in the academic community has a greater stake in the preservation of our basic freedoms than the field of speech, and no field has more to lose in a totalitarian society than the field of speech.

If an informed, responsible person does not have the freedom to say what he feels he *must* say, he must either keep silence or compromise with his integrity. If he is content to say nothing, he loses,

first, the impulse to speak out and, next, the *habit* of speaking. We cannot forget that the arts of communication are learned, that they improve with exercise, and that they shrivel with disuse. On the other hand, if the creator sells his integrity when he meets totalitarian forces, he not only loses his soul, but also his freedom of utterance. Then it is all too plain that he speaks only when Big Brother tells him to, and says only what Big Brother allows him to say. He lives by sufferance. Persons who are familiar with the history of rhetoric know that in periods when representative government gave way to dictatorship and tyranny, public address in its deliberative and forensic manifestations was circumscribed and emasculated. If it can be said to have flourished at all, it turned to the arts of display and of ceremony. This state of affairs in two periods in the early history of the western world has long gone under the names of the First and Second Sophistic.

If teachers who freely give their allegiance to the field of speech wish to prevent an American sophistic, if they stand for the privilege and principles of responsible utterance, they must do more than exercise eternal vigilance. They must help to provide a climate for students in their classrooms and on their campuses which will prompt them to speak out whenever they have something to say and at the same time to learn gradually what integrity and responsibility mean in the arts of communication. There is no way to preserve the habit of freedom of speech without constantly exercising it, and there is no way to preserve confidence and respect in human relations without freedom in communication. I realize, of course, that teachers in our society have always striven thus; nevertheless, the signs of the hysteric times are around us, and the signs of fear and constraint come even from the classroom. In such times, surely, the teacher of speech is not less concerned with the future than the physicist who set loose Uranium 237.

If in unity there is strength, teachers may gain new hope and encouragement from the resolutions approved by the Speech Association of America at its 1952 convention:

Be it herewith resolved:

I. That we reaffirm our belief in the . . . free exchange of ideas;

II. That we condemn the increasing pressures which tend to intimidate free expression of convictions;

III. That we condemn loose charges of guilt by association, allegations of guilt without proof, the use of committees to suggest guilt without proper trial, and the reversal of the American tradition of the burden of proof wherein a person accused is presumed innocent until proved guilty;

IV. That we reaffirm our belief in the processes of free debate and discussion and our belief that the United States of America stands in present danger from the suppression of free speech rather than from the full use of all institutions which bring information and honest belief to the public forum.

I shall conclude by adapting a passage by Bower Aly, former editor of *The Quarterly Journal*. Teachers everywhere, and especially teachers of speech, must place high in their classrooms the rewards of freedom: the sense of identity common to men who participate in a shared decision; the general gain in knowledge and experience which comes from exchange of ideas and information; the confidence developed in a society where men are proud to say, as our fathers did when they heard dissent, "Well, after all, this is a free country."

THE EDUCATION OF A CIRCUIT RIDER

Paul H. Boase

ON a cold, dismal, rainy autumn afternoon in 1809, James B. Finley jogged along the Muskingum River on his way to Zanesville, Ohio. He had secured a saddle blanket for protection from the storm, had cut a hole in the center, and by thrusting his head through the aperture, converted the robe into an overcoat. As he rode into Zanesville, he stopped at a cabin, introduced himself as the new Methodist preacher, and asked for lodgings. The man thus solicited eyed the blanketed apparition skeptically and declared, "You look like anything else than a preacher"; but finally he consented to house the novice and hear him preach.[1] Only then did Finley realize the demands that his newly adopted vocation would make upon him—demands connected with life on horseback, unbroken wilderness, and the delivery of five to six sermons every week in cabins, churches, taverns, or the open field, to anyone willing or unwilling to listen. Only then did he realize that his mission, as he himself put it, "extended to every place this side of hell."[2] Nevertheless, he pursued that mission for the next forty-eight years; and thus he becomes of interest to those who study the forgotten careers of the circuit riders.

After preaching next day in the Zanesville log courthouse, the new circuit rider started on the first leg of the Wills Creek circuit, a 475-mile route in East Central Ohio, located 150 miles northeast of his home in New Market near Cincinnati. His wife and infant daughter stayed at New Market to fend for themselves until he could construct a log cabin for them nearer his new but temporary place of employment. Six miles east of Zanesville at a place designated as "brother Joseph's" was the next appointment on the Wills Creek circuit; there the new circuit rider preached again. These ceremonials, accompanied by those of praying, marrying, baptizing, and burying, continued for a month, when Finley completed his 475-mile journey and once again entered Zanesville, ready to start another round. In that year of 1809, thirty other circuit riders inscribed circles of Methodism in Ohio.[3]

Contemporary observers and modern writers have not always dealt kindly with the circuit rider. They naturally tend to emphasize the more flamboyant aspects of frontier revivalism at the expense of the less sensational but more enduring activities of the backwoods parson. Associating the itinerant exclusively with the revivalistic extravagances of the jerking, barking, irrational mob, they often picture him as an ignorant, illiterate, uneducated ranter—a muscular persuader incapable of making a rational appeal.[4] To be sure, the circuit rider in some degree deserved these epithets. He had little or no formal

Paul H. Boase (Ph.D., Wisconsin, 1952) is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of Debate at Oberlin College.

1 James B. Finley, *Autobiography*, ed. W. P. Strickland (Cincinnati, 1853), pp. 192-193.

2 *Ibid.*, p. 229.

3 *Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the Years 1773-1828* (New York, 1840), I, 184-186.

4 See Eliza W. Farnham, *Life in Prairie Land* (New York, 1846), pp. 335-341; and Harold E. Davis, "Religion in the Western Reserve, 1800-1825," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, XXXVIII (1929), 475-501.

education, and shared the frontiersman's suspicion of the college-bred minister from the East. On the frontier the itinerant probably found it persuasive to magnify his roughness. But a study of the education of Finley qualifies this inference to some extent, and reveals, to a degree, an apprenticed student familiar with the best available rhetorical theory and well versed in the liberal arts.

Unlike many of his colleagues, Finley had some formal education. His father, a Princeton graduate, and one of the pioneer Presbyterian preachers in the West, had opened one of the first schools in Kentucky, which James attended with ten or twelve other young men, who later became lawyers or Presbyterian ministers. In 1796 the Finley family helped settle Chillicothe, and shortly after, James was sent back to Kentucky to study medicine. In 1800 he abandoned that career to become a frontier hunter, and in his twentieth year, with his mother's help, he selected a bride fit to join him in this new life among associates picturesquely called the "hard-fisted honest yeomanry of the country . . . nature's noblemen."

From 1801 until 1809, thanks perhaps to his early training in a minister's household, the hunter wavered between moments of religious ecstacy and periods of rebellion against the church. He ably maintained the reputation of a preacher's son by achieving notoriety as the "New Market Devil"; his father's Calvinistic doctrines earned his deepest contempt; and the Methodists he branded "the worst of all deceivers." But this irreverence appeared not to satisfy him; he needed what he was spurning. Religious satisfaction did not become his, however, until he succumbed to his wife's plea that they both attend a Methodist class meeting. Shortly after, they enthusiastically joined the Methodists, and he was soon appointed class leader. Since he exhibited talent in public speaking, he was given an exhorter's license, which granted him the right to speak without using a Biblical text; a few months later he became a local preacher, but readily admitted that his first sermons were without "form and void."[5]

By frontier and circuit-riding standards, Finley was already an old man of twenty-eight. Moreover, he had dependents. Thus he appeared to face almost insuperable barriers to the itinerancy. The fact indeed that marriage usually terminated an itinerant's career is revealed in the rhyme of a circuit-riding bard bemoaning the loss of George Callahan, the first itinerant to preach in Ohio:

> That once illustrious Callahan,
> That fear'd not devil, no, nor man,
> Has felt the marriage fever;
> A gentle fair hangs on his arm—
> Thus he cries out, caught by the charm,
> 'Circuit—farewell—forever!'[6]

But in the eyes of the Western Conference, Finley possessed three prerequisites essential for every circuit rider, grace, gifts, and fruit, the last two of which summed up his skill in speech and persuasion.[7] The Conference therefore accepted him on trial and sent him 150 miles from home to ride the 475-mile Wills Creek circuit alone.[8]

In addition to the duty of riding the circuit, being accepted on trial meant from two to four years of intensive preparation for the ministry. A course of study to this end had always been prescribed, and by 1816 that course was

[5] Finley, *Autobiography*, pp. 113-192.

[6] Theophilus Arminius [i.e., T. Hinde], "Appendix to Sketches," *Methodist Magazine*, XI (1828), 191.

[7] *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York, 1832), pp. 45-46. Cited below under various dates of issue as *Discipline*.

[8] *Minutes*, I, 184.

recommended in the *Discipline*.[9] The *Discipline* was one of three books always in Finley's saddle bags, the other two being the Bible and the hymn book. The *Discipline* contained the doctrines, the general rules of Methodist organization and conduct, specific advice on preaching, and the explicit declaration that no candidate for admission to the ministry achieved "full connexion" until he gave "satisfactory evidence respecting his knowledge of those particular subjects . . . recommended to his consideration."[10]

In 1830 the Ohio Conference curriculum for the probationer included divinity, history, geography, grammar, rhetoric, logic, and philosophy, with appropriate textbooks assigned for each subject. For their work in rhetoric, the circuit riders used Blair's *Lectures on Rhetoric*,[11] Claude's *Essay on Preaching*,[12] and in some conferences, Whately's *Elements of Rhetoric*.[13] The Ohio Conference manuscript journal of 1830 declared: "It will be expected of the candidates for admission that they digest and make themselves acquainted with the subjects on which these books treat"; and no book, once commenced, was to be abandoned until "in some good degree" the matter was digested. "Let the studies be pursued patiently and perseveringly," the Conference advised, "and with an ordinary capacity the effort will be crowned with success."[14] The examination was apparently a solemn, serious ordeal, dubbed by junior circuit riders "the flint mill." One probationer confessed that his "fear and dread of 'the mill' " so confused and embarrassed him that he felt incapable of either thinking or speaking.[15]

Even after surviving "the mill" and achieving tenure, the circuit rider followed a permanent plan of study outlined in the *Discipline*. Four o'clock in the morning was adjudged a proper hour for rising; the first hour, and that from five to six in the evening, were for meditation, prayer, scripture reading, and a careful study of John Wesley's sermons and notes. After an hour for breakfast, the time from six until noon was to be used reading prayerfully "some of our best religious tracts." If after following this regimen any preacher were still "not more knowing," the *Discipline* concluded that the parson had neglected the first rule of the Methodist: "Be diligent—never be unemployed. Never be triflingly employed. Neither spend any more time at any place than is strictly necessary." Five hours out of every twenty-four were to be spent reading useful books only, and any circuit rider complaining of "no taste for reading" was warned to "contract a taste for it by use, or return to [his] former employment."[16]

How many frontier circuit riders followed Wesley's ascetic rule would be impossible to determine. Their journals, diaries, and memoirs, allowing for the average student's reluctance to underestimate his struggle for learning, reveal extraordinary efforts to achieve excellence in preaching. A few were proud of their lack of formal education; many wished they could have had more; all cherished memories of their beloved alma mater, "Brush College." Peter Parley recalled hearing a circuit rider whom he dubbed "a gifted poundtext" thus extoll the virtues of the uneducated

[9] *Discipline* (1817), pp. 36-37.
[10] *Discipline* (1832), pp. 33-34.
[11] MSS Journal, Ohio Conference, September 8, 1830, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.
[12] *Discipline* (1848), p. 216.
[13] [Merrit Caldwell]. "Elocution," *Methodist Quarterly Review*, XXVII (1845), 415.
[14] MSS Journal, Ohio Conference, September 8, 1830.
[15] Alfred Brunson, *A Western Pioneer* (Cincinnati, 1880), I, 260.
[16] *Discipline* (1832), pp. 60-61.

minister: "What I insist upon my brethren and sisters is this: larnin isn't religion, and eddication don't give a man the power of the spirit. . . . St. Peter was a fisherman—do you think he ever went to Yale College? Yet he was the rock upon which Christ built his Church. . . . When the Lord wanted to blow down the walls of Jericho, he didn't take a brass trumpet, or a polished French horn: no such thing; he took a ram's horn—a plain, natural ram's horn. . . . He don't take one of your smooth, polite college larnt gentlemen, but a plain, natural ram's-horn sort of man like me."[17]

Among most Ohio circuit riders, however, learning and study were not despised. The Ohio Conference, supported by ministerial testimony, constantly proclaimed that none achieved excellence in preaching without developing routine study habits. "We would not decry knowledge," wrote Finley. "God forbid! Let the minister of the present day study all the branches of theological literature, and all collateral sciences, posting himself up thoroughly in all departments. . . ."[18] More than fifty years in the itinerancy convinced Finley's good friend, Jacob Young, to encourage every beginning preacher "thirsting for knowledge" to attend college before entering the itinerancy.[19] John Stewart mourned his failure to secure a formal education. So impressed was he by Miami University as he traveled the Oxford circuit in 1830 that he expressed the desire to give up the itinerancy until he secured a college degree, but family responsibilities frustrated his plans.[20]

Scarcely a circuit rider penned his memoirs without referring to his struggle to master the academic and physical rigors of "Brush College." John Strange, the first itinerant to ride with Finley,[21] eulogized the timberland institution as "less pretentious, than Yale, or Harvard, or Princeton," yet filled with "Pierian springs . . . Arcadian groves and Orphic songs. . . . Her curriculum is the philosophy of nature and the mysteries of redemption; her library is the word of God, the discipline and hymn book, supplemented with trees and brooks and stones, all of which are full of wisdom and sermons and speeches; and her parchments of literary honors are the horse and saddle-bags."[22] Finley, who was less grandiloquent but more precise, declared: "My place of study was the forest, and my principal text books the Bible, Discipline, doctrinal tracts, and the works of Wesley and Fletcher."[23]

Besides advising Finley on methods and material for study, the *Discipline* served as his rule book on public speaking. Answering the question, "What is the best general method of preaching?" the *Discipline* listed the purposes of pulpit oratory: "1. To convince; 2. To offer Christ; 3. To invite; 4. To build up; And to do this in some measure in every sermon." Ten "smaller advices" followed:

1. Be sure never to disappoint a congregation.
2. Begin at the time appointed.
3. Let your whole deportment be serious, weighty, and solemn.
4. Always suit your subject to your audience.
5. Choose the plainest text you can.
6. Take care not to ramble, but keep to your text, and make out what you take in hand.
7. Take care of anything awkward or affected, either in your gesture, phrase, or pronunciation.
8. Do not usually pray *extempore*, above eight

[17] Samuel G. Goodrich, *Recollections of a Life Time* (New York, 1856), I, 196-197.

[18] James B. Finley, *Sketches of Western Methodism*, ed. W. P. Strickland (Cincinnati, 1855), pp. 179-180.

[19] Jacob Young, *Autobiography of a Pioneer* (Cincinnati, 1857), pp. 76-77.

[20] John Stewart, *Highways and Hedges* (Cincinnati, 1872), pp. 169-170.

[21] Finley, *Autobiography*, p. 200.

[22] J. C. Smith, *Reminiscences of Early Methodism in Indiana* (Indianapolis, 1879), pp. 38-39.

[23] Finley, *Autobiography*, p. 196.

or ten minutes (at most) without intermission.

9. Frequently read and enlarge upon a portion of Scripture; and let young preachers often exhort without taking a text.
10. Always avail yourself of the great festivals, by preaching on the occasion.[24]

As important as the training Finley received from the *Discipline* and the conference course of study was the counsel of his ministerial colleagues. That Finley traveled the Wills Creek circuit alone was the exception. Usually the probationer rode as junior assistant to a veteran, and during the long rides each often broke the silence of the wilderness with a sermon followed by a critique from the other.[25] Even in their correspondence, sermonizing was a favorite topic. In 1830 Finley wrote to Thomas A. Morris of Columbus seeking advice on appropriate preaching methods for a Cincinnati audience. For twenty years before that date Finley had been serving circuits, or preaching to the Wyandot Indians at Upper Sandusky, or performing the duties of a presiding elder. Preaching in the Queen City, he complained, was truly perplexing because the "big folks" in his congregation presented "rather an appalling front."

Morris's counsel to Finley in 1830 not only serves as an example of the tutorial relationship between preachers; it has also three other values. It reveals a concept of persuasion held by some circuit riders; it portrays a pulpit technique sometimes employed; and it indicates the growing sophistication of the Methodist audience. "We have a few of the same kind of cattle here," Morris wrote consolingly in reply to Finley's letter, "and I find the easiest method with them is to give them what they frequently need, namely, a severe pulpit malling." These "worldly wise" congregations want a learned preacher, Morris continued sarcastically. "He should seem to rise above the frank simplicity of Peter and Paul, learn to call hard things by soft names; and bow to doctors, statesmen, and all the fashionables of the day with the sprightliness of a Frenchman." Morris expressed his unwillingness to be diplomatic with that kind of congregation; he labeled himself "so much of a 'whole hog' Methodist as to decline all the deceitful amalgamations of aspiring . . . parties; the consequence of which is I am getting my name up among them—I tell them that the Devil has a bill of sale for them, is leading them the downward road." When some of his congregation bought tickets for a "catgut party" on Christmas eve, Morris boasted that he met the challenge by setting "off a full charged Kentucky broadside at them to which the London Fire of 1666 was a mere squib." The results, he confessed, were not immediately persuasive. "Thank God my bones are all whole yet. . . . Whether I shall ever see land this year or not God only knows." Nevertheless, he assured Finley of his intention to continue that type of preaching. "There is a peculiar work before me: for I am determined to let loose on a gambling house, whisky shops, and all sorts of devilism, neck or nothing; and you know how few we have to help us in such oxidation."[26]

The most literate circuit riders did not confine their writing to personal correspondence, but wrote for church periodicals and published books at the Methodist Book Concern in Cincinnati. The *Methodist Magazine, Zion's Herald, Western Christian Advocate, Ladies Repository,* were fertile sources for articles on preaching. These periodicals, indeed, usually contained sections on

[24] *Discipline* (1832), pp. 46-47.
[25] Young, *Autobiography*, p. 228.
[26] Thomas A. Morris to James B. Finley, January 11, 1831, Finley Papers, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio.

homiletics and discussed all phases of speech preparation from invention to memory.

A regular contributor to the church periodicals, Finley also published an autobiography, as well as a work on Western Circuit Riders, two histories of the Wyandot Indian Mission, and an account of his work as chaplain in the Ohio State Penitentiary. Each of these books is liberally sprinkled with homiletic advice. On invention and disposition, he stressed study and adaptation. "With too many preachers," he wrote, "all the ambition they seem to have in preparing for the pulpit, is to commit to writing or memory a few skeletons . . . and . . . as mere parrots, they 'mount the pulpit with a skip,' repeat their memoriter harangues, and then 'skip' down again."[27] Urging his colleagues to study every area of theology, he assured them that "God will [not] prepare sermons for drones, or . . . convert a dull and stupid intellect into a bright one."[28] Preachers, he counseled, must take "their Bibles into their study, if they have one, and if not, to the woods, and there, by prayer and close, laborious thought, after finding a subject adapted to their hearers, study it out in all its connections and bearings, filling their minds and hearts full of the theme, and then going . . . into their pulpits, or school-houses, or log-cabins, and pouring out the garnered truths with their full hearts. . . ."

In his commentary on style, Finley complained about those ministers "so wonderfully enraptured with anything of a metaphysical or transcendental cast, that the plain, home, heart-searching truths of the Gospel are lost sight of. . . . Their sermons are so festooned with the flowers of rhetoric, or scented with the phrases of metaphysics, or incased with the technicalities of logic, that the mind neither comprehends, appreciates, nor enjoys the preaching, if it may so be called."[29]

In the area of delivery, Finley and his colleagues held the extempore mode superior. Their abhorrence of a manuscript was matched only by their admiration for the ideal circuit rider described by Peter Cartwright: ". . . a preacher that could mount a stump, block, or old log, or stand in the bed of a wagon, and without note or manuscript, quote, expound, and apply the word of God to the hearts and consciences of the people."[30] The average itinerant joined Abel Stevens, historian of American Methodism, in ridiculing as a jackass "any popular orator who should attempt to *read* the masses into enthusiasm on some high occasion of national exigency. . . ."[31] Finley's prescription for achieving perfection in extemporaneous speech, and avoiding the "mimic artificial man" was a return to nature. Nature was the "fountain from whence the orator must draw his inspiration," he declared, "and the field whereon he must develop his powers."[32] A writer for the *Western Christian Advocate* concurred, asserting that the "natural manner" was the way "nature would speak . . . if she were encouraged. . . ."[33] Excellence in delivery might be considered a "gift," declared the *Zion's Herald;* yet it was a gift that could be "obtained by prayer, and strengthened by exercize," or lost by "unbelief, a regard of self, and fear of man."[34] To Abel Stevens, a British

[27] Finley, *Sketches*, p. 97.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 180.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 97.
[30] Peter Cartwright, *Autobiography*, ed. W. P. Strickland (Cincinnati, 1857), p. 358.
[31] [Abel Stevens], "Methodist Preaching," *Methodist Quarterly Review*, XXXIV (1852), 80.
[32] Finley, *Sketches*, p. 432.
[33] "On a Natural Manner in Public Speaking," *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati, February 10, 1837).
[34] *Zion's Herald* (Boston, April 25, 1827).

author pictured the perfect model for extempore speaking by comparing it to "earnest conversation—intent on convincing his friend of some momentous truth, or dissuading him from some fatal measure. Greater dignity or vehemence . . . will often arise from the greater importance of the subject or a larger audience," but the same "general traits" of excellent conversation will remain.[35]

Finley and his associates were the book agents, newspaper carriers, and magazine vendors on the frontier. These adventitious occupations were financially rewarding; and the *Discipline* reminded the circuit rider that preachers "diligent" in distributing books to their flocks would never lack reading material for themselves.[36] It seems safe to assume that the itinerant used these periodicals and books as supplementary help in his course of study, and for sermon preparation.

The Methodists were the last major denomination to arrive on the American scene and the smallest sect at the close of the Revolution. Yet by 1857, the year Finley died, the Methodists outnumbered all other sects in Ohio. The training and preparation that these mounted parsons of the frontier received through the *Discipline*, through their work as apprentice ministers, and through the advice they received from church newspapers, magazines, and books are in part an explanation for this rapid growth. Charles Grandison Finney, second President of Oberlin College, and one of the most effective preachers of the nineteenth century, has paid a worthy tribute to the circuit riders. Addressing his colleagues in the Congregational and Presbyterian churches, he declared: "Many ministers are finding out already that a Methodist preacher without the advantages of a liberal education will draw a congregation around him which other ministers with ten times as much learning cannot equal." And he added that his own brethren must emulate the circuit riders' persuasive method, "or the devil will have the people, except what the Methodists can save."[37]

[35] A. S. [i.e., Abel Stevens], "Pulpit Eloquence," *Methodist Quarterly Review*, XXV (1843), 535.

[36] *Discipline* (1832), p. 61.

[37] Charles G. Finney, *Lectures on Revivals* (London, 1835), pp. 230-231.

EXTEMPORANEOUS PREACHING

> At funerals, at conference meetings, and in neighborhood gatherings, where there are a thousand incidental points to which a minister is called upon to speak, nothing will answer but unwritten discourse. Who could go into a rude neighborhood of turbulent spirits and hope to gain and hold their attention by reading from a manuscript? Who can preach the gospel to the unlettered and the stupid, when the point of the pen has been substituted for the living fire? A physician would be ashamed to sit at the bedside of his patient, carrying his library of books with him. His knowledge must be such, and his use of it so facile, that he can, out of the stores of his own mind, readily adapt himself to every varying phase of want. The preacher is a physician of the soul. With thousand-fold reason should he be able, with adaptable skill, to vary to every form of disposition the resources of Divine truth.
>
> Henry Ward Beecher, *Yale Lectures on Preaching* (New York, 1873), p. 215.

ORAL INTERPRETATION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS CONTEXT

Don Geiger

THERE has been a growing belief in recent years that oral interpretation is an effective means of comprehending and communicating literature and that thus it deserves its respected place in the academy's anthology of "liberal" or "humanizing" courses. Oral interpretation, cast for this role, takes part in a larger drama in which both Speech and English departments have attempted to combat a too-exclusive stress on the study of facts *about* literature. Many professors of oral interpretation, eager to encourage a new stress on intrinsic study, have consequently assumed that *one* valid approach to a study of literature itself is through the discipline of oral interpretation. Put more broadly, in terms of the total education of the student, they have assumed that one of the most obvious and necessary characteristics of the liberally educated person will be his knowledge and mastery of the human modes of communication, and that oral interpretation is a very valuable means of comprehending the special sort of communication which is effected by literary art.

I put this summarily because I assume that it has now become familiar doctrine. It has perhaps always been the assumption underlying much of the work in oral interpretation.

Yet the familiarity of the doctrine does not imply its universal acceptance. In a recent survey of the theory of oral interpretation,[1] Professor Donald Hargis suggests at least four of the more powerful arguments against such a conception of the work: each of them is valuable because each has some unquestionable element of truth in it. In what follows I should like to comment on these arguments with the aim in mind of suggesting something of the function and values of the oral interpretation of literature.

1. In his interesting analysis of the theory of interpretation, Professor Hargis concludes that the only definition which will cover the emphases of the various theorists is that oral interpretation is essentially "the oral re-creation for a listener of an author's point of view as expressed in written materials";[2] that is, it is reading something aloud to somebody. We might very well nod acceptance to this as a description of the lowest common denominator of agreement among all the workers in oral interpretation; but Professor Hargis comes very close to permitting the descriptive summary to slide casually into a normative judgment. He is eager, he says, to remove "an exclusively literary or artistic bias" from our work, suggesting that it "matters little whether or not the thoughts expressed be universal and enduring," for "the same study" must be made by the oral reader of anything he happens to be reading, whether or not

Don Geiger (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1951), Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of California at Berkeley, has contributed frequently to journals in the field of speech and literature.

[1] Donald E. Hargis, "What Is Oral Interpretation?," *Western Speech*, XVI (May 1952), 175-180.

[2] Hargis, *op. cit.*, p. 180.

it is literature and regardless of its value.[3]

At a certain level of implication, this is a reasonable plea for recognizing that oral interpretation may function valuably in different ways. As an element in the training of actors and public speakers, for example, oral interpretation may be of substantial value; we might draw up a fairly long list of the values, educational and vocational, that oral interpretation may provide one student or another. Here I am interested only in observing that, in our distress at an exclusive application of oral interpretation to the literary art, we must not ask for another, and even more dubious, order of exclusion. Mr. Hargis wisely remarks that "the basic principles of interpretation apply equally to *all* written materials when they are read aloud, whether they are literary or not,"[4] but we must also carefully observe the occasions on which it is important whether these materials are literary or not.

The more inclusive analysis, it would seem, would admit of the possibilities of maintaining different aims for oral interpretation within the context of different educational and vocational systems; but would require that, within a given context, certain of the possible number of aims probably *ought* to be excluded. For example, an instructor hardly need introduce the study of Keats's poetry into an evening course designed to help businessmen read committee reports; and, in a course designed for future radio announcers, the student might well study chiefly the kind of material his work will later demand from him.

To mention these possibilities is surely to make clear what kind of material will *not* be read within the context of the educational program of the liberal arts college. It is not only reasonable but mandatory that courses in oral interpretation functioning within such programs strongly stress, or even be strictly limited to, the reading of the best of literature. The needs of most of the students of these colleges do not include professional competence in oral reading, or anything like it; their needs do include comprehension of literature. If oral interpretation is, as many of us think it is, an aid to them in developing such a comprehension, then it should by all means implement programs of literary education. In a large enough program, even in the liberal arts program, advanced work may well aim at accomplishing polished performance; in a smaller program, performance may well be thought of as a means to the end of literary understanding.

Some months ago I talked with the president of one of the older and more famous small eastern colleges, a college in which Speech of any kind is not yet part of the curriculum. Apparently it will soon be added, and, when it is, work in oral interpretation, as an aid in coming to understand and communicate literature, will be one of its most important features. Evidently the faculty of this college has no intention of developing professionally expert readers; but, intending to do as much as possible to increase their students' understanding and communication of literary statement, they believe that oral interpretation is one of the available means to this latter end.

I mention this specific instance merely in order to indicate that I am not talking in a theoretical vacuum. Instead, such concrete plans indicate that the dimension of oral interpretation which gives the greatest prospect for immediate

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 180.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 180.

growth is in this area of advancing literary understanding: that is, in an area where an exclusive attention to the literary or artistic "bias" is very much in order.

2. To ask for the oral interpretation of literature, and especially of the best of literature, certainly implies that one knows what he means by "literature" and "best." Mr. Hargis challenges the interpretation theorists with the assertion that, though most of them talk about literature, none of them defines it, that they show a considerable "confusion" in "delimiting the material which the interpreter may use," and even that "most" of the texts include "items which are highly suspect."[5]

This is a challenge which should properly embarrass us. Certainly we are all familiar with the oral interpretation book whose opening chapters drum up the power of literature, but whose later chapters present a ragged and disconsolate troop of hackneyed selections. But we must beware of inferences which Mr. Hargis' analysis too easily permits us. To point to weak textbooks is not to argue against the literary "bias" or the need for oral interpretation of the high forms of literature; it is simply to argue against assembling anthologies in which the best of literary work does not importantly appear. In general, it seems to me that our texts are constantly improving in this respect, and that they will continue to do so, as we face squarely our responsibilities to liberal education.

There is a level of discussion at which none of us dares be arrogant about the question of literary value. Mr. Hargis, rather harshly critical of the apprehension of literary value by his colleagues in oral interpretation, is unduly humble perhaps in his regard for the literary sense of the professor of literature. He suggests that if the oral interpreter wants to know what literature should be read, he should ask the literary scholars.[6] But the problem of what is valuable is not so easily decided. The English professor is up against it just as we are up against it when trying to decide whether or not Shelley should go up the scale and Donne down or vice versa, or whether Archibald MacLeish is in the canon or out of it. What he is up against are the most intricate value-problems and the most subtle value-theories.

But at the practical level of drawing up programs in a liberal arts college, the problem really disappears. Or, to put it another way, it should appear for the teacher of oral interpretation in no more sinister form than it appears for the teacher of English. Each teacher is committed to the presentation of works of such-and-such qualities, much as an American jurist is, I suppose, confined to the elucidation of a certain order of law. That is, each teacher assumes the burden of a slowly developing and slowly changing canon of "good" literature, from which he must select according to his and his colleagues' evaluations and the extent of the program in which he participates.

The really necessary work, then, for the teacher of the oral interpretation of literature is not to slay the ultimate dragons of value-theory; it is, more simply, to make a proper selection for study in oral interpretation from the kind of literature traditionally offered within the liberal arts program.

No doubt different selections will be made in different colleges. At the eastern college to which I have already referred, I believe it is tentatively planned that the oral readings be somehow correlated with the material that is studied

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

in the various lecture and discussion classes in literature. This should prove to be a satisfactory arrangement, if the interpretation instructor has a voice equal to his colleagues' in course organization. Where the Speech department offers its own courses, still other programs will have to be worked out, the nature of the individual courses depending on the extent of the program. It may be supposed that at most colleges an introductory course is, or will be, followed by at least one advanced course. For the introductory study, it would seem reasonable to use anthologies of the order of Brooks and Warren's, or Van Doren's, or Oscar Williams',[7] or any of several others, in fiction and in poetry. In the advanced course, the instructor might well aim at helping his students to a partial mastery, at least, of some given poet—Hardy, let us say, or Yeats or Donne—or of some given fictionist of major stature, with each student eventually presenting a lecture-recital of the writer's work.

I do not mean to recommend a specific program; that can only be done satisfactorily within a given situation. But the concrete example at least suggests the proper line of direction for oral interpretation within the liberal arts framework. The student cannot expect a total knowledge of literature from his work in oral interpretation; what he can expect is a new kind of acquaintance with the same order of literature that he studies elsewhere in the college, the literature of the great liberal arts tradition.

3. Mr. Hargis recommends a principle of selection different from this, in terms of the limits of the reader rather than in terms of the limits of the material. He writes: "When the interpreter chooses his materials to read aloud he must not only understand their meaning, but he must also sympathize with these ideas, enjoy them, and agree with them, in order to communicate the thought which the author intends."[8]

This is a sound or unsound analysis only according to what is meant by it. Mr. Hargis' examples are troubling. He suggests that it is probably impossible for a reader who believes in "the capitalistic system" to read aloud effectively an essay which attacks that system. "In the same way," he writes, "the city-dwelling interpreter may be hard pressed to feel sympathy for a 17th century pastoral lyric."[9] Such examples leave us free to think that Mr. Hargis means something which no teacher of the liberal arts dares to accept: that the student's mind is a closed corporation of evaluations, opinions, and prejudices, which no widening familiarity with great literature under the guidance of sympathetic instruction can extend. There is a sophistic view of oral reading as there is of public speaking, according to which the instructor says to his student, "Say to me or read to me what you like; I will comment on your melody pattern."

If the teacher of oral interpretation in the liberal arts college must, like his colleagues in public speaking, unequivocally reject this view, he must nevertheless account for much that is legitimate in analyses like that of Mr. Hargis. Simply, the reader must understand and sympathize with the materials he reads in order to do a good job of oral reading. But to notice so much is not to say that one must submit the nature of the curriculum to the chance tastes of the assembled undergraduates.

[7] See, for example, Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Poetry* (New York, 1950); Mark Van Doren, *Introduction to Poetry* (New York, 1951); Oscar Williams, *A Little Treasury of Great Poetry* (New York, 1947).

[8] Hargis, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 178.

To notice the need of the reader for understanding and sympathy is, instead, to become aware of the demands placed on both teachers and students of oral interpretation.

The teacher must obviously be competent to aid his students in the understanding of literature—the literature of the great fictionists and the great poets. Patently, it will not be sufficient for the teacher of oral interpretation to scan the curriculum of the English department and then piously introduce this "accepted" literature into his own course. What is demanded of him is not piety but awareness. He must know how language works in literature and be competent to elucidate the patterns of the best works; he must be the kind of instructor who can aid his students in such tasks as understanding by comparison and by contrast the function of allusion in Milton and the function of allusion in Eliot; he must be able to notice and distinguish the kinds of symbolism in Melville and Kafka; he must understand and be able to teach understanding of all elements of a story or a poem in their organic relationships. He must know these things because, according to the familiar dictum, he must know the art if he is to express it—and because the art of serious literature, rich treasure that it is, does not easily become the possession of any man. The instructor may hope to delight his students with the rewards of close study, but that close study must be attained.

The student's obligation, then, is to make the intellectual effort required to understand the selection with which he is confronted and the imaginative effort to sympathize with its contents. That is, simply, his obligation is to think of himself as the college treats him, as an educable human being.

Such an attitude, desirable in all of the student's work, is especially so in his relationship to literature; it requires nothing more than a proper observation of the nature and value of literature. Whatever else they may be, works of literature are certainly "imaginative prehensions of the world,"[10] and they require of us—indeed, this is their virtue—that we see many aspects of our world in a light which would otherwise be unfamiliar or unknown to us. In Coleridge's brilliant phrase, the reader must exercise "that willing suspension of disbelief for the moment, which constitutes poetic faith."[11] This is not a mere coaching in relativism; it is an extension of the borders of thought and human sympathy. That person who is least secure outside the confines of his own opinions and beliefs, who cannot hear contradictory opinions in the realm of politics or religion, for example, without experiencing the most disturbing emotions, may nevertheless find it possible to appreciate the insights of literature despite any disturbing implications. Mr. Yvor Winters, for example, perhaps the most famous modern absolutistic critic, puts this very clearly in his remarks on Wallace Stevens' poem, "Sunday Morning." Winters, approving the poem as "one of the few great poems of the twentieth century in America," suggests that its doctrine is essentially "Paterian hedonism." Winters then indicates that his "dislike for the philosophy is profound"; yet he goes on to say, "But I know that hedonists exist, and the state of mind portrayed in the poem seems proper to them, and moreover it seems beautifully portrayed."[12] Manifold life and the

[10] D. G. James, "I. A. Richards," *Critiques and Essays in Criticism*, ed. R. W. Stallman (New York, 1949), p. 472.

[11] Samuel Taylor Coleridge, "From *Biographia Literaria*, XIV," *Essays in Modern Literary Criticism*, ed. Ray B. West (New York, 1952).

[12] Yvor Winters, *In Defense of Reason* (New York, 1947), p. 476.

manifold literature which represents it may ask at least this degree of tolerance from the most absolutistic observer.

If this is the proper attitude toward the nature of literature, it provides us, incidentally, with one of our most powerful reasons for approaching it through oral interpretation. When a student's study of literature is evaluated according to his ability to abstract from it its themes or to remember his instructor's opinions of it, he may possibly receive commendation for his study without ever having submitted his imagination to the whole of the work. But in an oral reading, if the student is to reproduce the attitudes and feelings of the work, he must obviously first experience them. The instructor's job is not one of telling the student to experience merely what the student likes or what he has already experienced; such advice would mark only an individual educator's personal despair. It is instead his job to help the student participate imaginatively in what he does not like or what is, in many particulars, foreign to his experience. This is to share in the task of the humanities to widen and enrich the individual experience.

4. Mr. Hargis finds still another reason for rejecting the selection of material according to its intrinsic merit. He suggests that the nature of the audience provides another important criterion for the reader's selection, that what is read must take into account the "interests, experience level, and capacity for understanding" of the audience.[13]

To some extent, of course, this criterion has nothing to do with the problems of the oral interpretation of literature in the classroom situation. I presume that, in such a situation, the poem or story is usually read aloud only after the class as a whole has become familiar with it through private reading and class discussion. Such a procedure deprives the reader of a chance to stun his "audience" of students with a surprise ending but, happily, little of the literature he reads in such a class will be limited to such primitive qualities. Instead, for the oral reader in this situation, his reading will be the means of making public his own impression of and insight into the poem, and for his fellow students his reading will be a model for comparison with their own insights and impressions; while for the class as a whole, including the instructor, the reading will provide a concrete stimulus to other shared contemplations of a piece that deserves rereading.

To the extent that Mr. Hargis' analysis of the importance of an audience is applicable to the oral interpretation of literature, it is again true or false only according to what one means by it. Let us imagine, for example, a class in which all the members eventually present programs of readings before some group of persons other than their classmates: one of them will read for a literary club, another for a fraternity banquet, still another for a businessmen's luncheon group, etc. (Such an assignment is not a necessary one in a liberal arts program but would of course be a desirable one, if the audiences could be arranged.)

Obviously, Mr. Hargis is correct in saying that the nature of the audience must be analyzed and the program formed in accordance with that analysis. What we should object to in Mr. Hargis' statement is not that he wants to analyze the audience but that he makes his analysis too simple. Saying correctly that material must be selected "in terms of the capabilities of the audience to understand and appreciate so that there is communication," he says flatly that he is not interested in "raising

[13] Hargis, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

levels" of audience appreciation.[14] I fear we can only understand this as the recommendation to read whatever the oral reader thinks his audience will like, regardless of its merit.

But the oral reader (especially the instructor in a liberal arts program who is likely to read even more frequently to audiences than his students do) in his public function has a different and greater responsibility. His responsibility is not to avoid reading serious literature to the "average" audience in whose interest Mr. Hargis especially worries, but to help make that serious literature *available* to the average audience. (I am thinking, of course, of the "average" college-age or adult audience.)

To think that serious literature is actually "addressed" to somebody or to some particular audience with its particular mental and psychological limitations is, ordinarily, to commit the fallacy of confusing a piece of literature with a whisky advertisement.[15] Richard Wilbur writes suggestively, "A poem is addressed to the Muse," and then says explicitly what most serious writers would surely agree to: "During the act of writing, the poem is an effort to express a knowledge imperfectly felt, to articulate relationships not quite seen, to make or discover some pattern in the world. It is a conflict with disorder, not a message from one person to another. Once the poem is written and published, however, it belongs to anyone who will take it, and the more the better."[16]

The oral interpreter's job is to make the good books sell better. He has two chief means of making the work available to audiences. One means depends on the most acute sort of audience analysis: he must learn what and how much he must say to a given audience in order properly to frame or introduce his material. Here all his means of persuasion and adaptability to audience limits are of utmost importance. But to make an audience pleased with the possibility of hearing a great work is a very different thing from ingratiating one's self with an audience by reading something that's bound to be "popular" with them. No doubt there are excellent human motives for reading the merely "popular" to people who ask for it—it is a way of increasing one's income or of keeping busy, for example. But such motives, innocent as they may be, have nothing to do with the oral interpretation of literature nor the responsibilities of the teacher or student of oral interpretation whose work is performed within the context of the liberal arts tradition.

The second means for communicating the difficult or superior work to the "average" audience is, of course, the reading itself. We may assume that the responsible oral reader has himself had a keen insight into the work and is so skilled in his communication of that insight that his reading itself provides a means of audience prehension. In short, listening to a skillful oral reading is itself one means of discovering the qualities of a given work of literature. For example, for some years now a very ap-

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 179.

[15] Even superior work which seems to "address" a particular audience—one recalls, for example, Pope's satires, the occasional poetry of Dryden, even some of the work of Shakespeare—is memorable, we think, because it was so well formed that it transcended its local purpose. Much of the worst of these—and other—writers' work is bad, we suppose, just because it was so particularly "addressed" to some particular audience. In our time, no one has been more insistent on the "communicative" aspects of literature than Professor I. A. Richards; yet he concludes—see *Principles of Literary Criticism* (New York, 1949), p. 27—that "Those artists and poets who can be suspected of close separate attention to the communicative aspect tend . . . to fall into a subordinate rank."

[16] Richard Wilbur, "The Genie in the Bottle," *Mid-Century American Poets*, ed. John Ciardi (New York, 1950), pp. 2-3.

preciative public of "average" citizens has applauded the oral readings of Mr. Charles Laughton, who, if he does not always read the greatest literature, does not either read the kind of Pocketbook pabulum on which it is often assumed that the "average" man sustains the life of his mind.

A really skillful criticism provides one order of insight into the nature of a piece of literature; a really skillful oral reading provides another order of insight. We may hope for the time when the colleges will produce as many students of literature capable of effecting the latter order as they have already so brilliantly produced students capable of the former.

In conclusion, we have in this article inspected carefully four important arguments against emphasizing oral interpretation as a means to furthering our understanding of literature. We have also seen that, despite their partial truth, these arguments need not disturb our conviction that most college students should concentrate on the reading of "good literature," the literature of the great liberal arts tradition. We have, incidentally, considered some of the unique values of oral interpretation as a means of literary study and something of the oral interpreter's special responsibility to the literary understanding of the community at large.

Surely such a view of his work presents the teacher of oral interpretation with a challenge which he can, with some dignity and considerable humility, gladly accept.

WAGNER AND FAUST ON PERSUASION

Wagner When in his study pent the whole year through,
Man views the world, as through an optic glass,
On a chance holiday, and scarcely then,
How by persuasion can he govern men?

Faust If feeling prompt not, if it doth not flow
Fresh from the spirit's depths, with strong control
Swaying to rapture every listener's soul,
Idle your toil; the chase you may forego!
Brood o'er your task! Together glue,
Cook from another's feast your own ragout,
Still prosecute your paltry game,
And fan your ash-heaps into flame!
Thus children's wonder you'll excite,
And apes', if such your appetite;
But that which issues from the heart alone,
Will bend the hearts of others to your own.

Goethe, *Faust*, Part I.

RANDOM REFLECTIONS ON PUBLIC SPEAKING

Norman Thomas

DURING most of my active life, public speaking has been my business. I have been immensely concerned with the message or messages I wanted to convey to my fellow countrymen and I have been greatly preoccupied with particular speeches. But only recently, and then partly as a result of prodding from without, have I seriously reflected on public speaking as an art. In my own youthful experience, I owed far more to practice in high school and college than to any systematic instruction. In later years, I was under compulsion, I felt, to take every opportunity to reach an audience. In my presidential campaigns as a socialist candidate I was obliged to give the essentials of my platform in every town. It was, therefore, impossible to have a great variety of speeches. My task it was, if for no other reason than to deliver myself from unendurable monotony, to think of different ways appropriate to my audiences to deliver one of two or three basic speeches. It was not a situation to call forth classic eloquence.

I begin these reflections with recognition of our peculiar American interest in the spoken word. We are not great readers, at least of books, but we are avid listeners to speakers. Usually, I prefer reading, but I have some reason to be thankful that other people like to go to meetings. I speak at many of them. And by choice or necessity I have heard my share or more of other speakers of all sorts and kinds.

I reflect with mixed emotions on one very common type of meeting. It is, as you know, an American custom to eat public dinners to help the starving in other lands or regions. I once suggested as my epitaph, "Here lies the body of one who died eating his way to Utopia." I have not only sung myself for many a supper, but listened to many of my fellow Tommy Tuckers engaged in the same task. Our songs were rarely memorable, but neither were the suppers. The best that can be said is that these dinner or luncheon meetings aren't worse than others.

In the course of the year, in almost any sizable American county, church services and meetings, political rallies, meetings of civic societies, women's clubs, labor, farmer and business organizations, gatherings of college and high school students, alumni and other groups, add up to an enormous total. If the speakers at these affairs could be stood one on top of another, towards the heavens, their towers of Babel would dwarf Mt. Everest.

Despite our addictions to meetings and our much practice in speaking, our general performance is depressingly mediocre. Not much of our public speaking is unmitigatedly bad. Some of it is good or very good. But the statistical average is a boring commonplace.

Norman Thomas, famous American socialist, began his career as a Presbyterian minister. He left the ministry in 1918 and became a spokesman for the socialist cause. Since that time he has campaigned for election as governor of New York, mayor of New York City, representative in Congress, and President of the United States. As he himself says in the present article, he has addressed audiences in every state of the United States except Nevada. According to the testimony of those who have heard him speak, he is one of the great American speakers of the twentieth century. He writes here, as some great speakers of the past have done, on the art which he has practiced with distinction.

In recent years, I have been asking myself why. What follows is a preliminary answer to the question combined with some suggestions for improvement.

As I write, I recall the old story of the woman who recommended herself as a children's nurse. She knew, she said, all about children. She had lost six. Well, I have lost six presidential campaigns, and I forget how many others for less important offices. Obviously I have been no shining success in the arts of persuasion. Nevertheless, my failure has not been total, and my experience has been extensive, much of it under circumstances which required me to gain at least a temporary attention of audiences in which the majority of listeners were suspicious of, or hostile to, my particular message. I have spoken from soap boxes, platforms, radio and television studios; in churches; at noisy street corners; at strike and protest meetings; and to educational societies and associations. I have addressed clubs of all sorts and political rallies and mass meetings and small groups and conferences. I have held forth in every American state (except Nevada) and in some foreign countries. Most of my audiences have been free, but I have addressed captive audiences in prisons and college chapels.

It will be clear from this introduction, that I am not discussing public speaking as oratory. Great oratory is great art, at its best to be reckoned among man's glories. But, not without reason, oratory has been called the harlot of the arts, so subject is it to abuse and degradation. The principles of oratory can be expounded helpfully, as for example in Cicero's *De Oratore*. Unlike some teachers, Cicero could practice what he preached. But schools can no more make Ciceros out of speakers than Carusos out of singers. Your genuine orators in the classic tradition are, like other great artists, few in number. Perhaps Churchill in our times best meets the test. And that of itself is not a calamity. If there are few great orators, there are comparatively few occasions to which oratory is essential or even appropriate. Short of honest oratory, and infinitely better than an indifferent or dishonest aping of it, there may be effective communication of ideas by means of public speech which can be acquired by study and practice.

The first essential is that the speaker should have something to say and be reasonably sure himself what that something is. Most speakers have an emotion, a prejudice, a slogan, some facts, or even an idea which they want to impart. But many of them do not develop their theme, whatever it is, logically, critically, or persuasively. They never listen to themselves and ask the essential questions: Is that so? And so what?* Some speakers assume that because they have The Truth on their side, facts don't matter; others act as if the text, "Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh," absolved them from any use of their heads. More than once I have heard good men come out second best to demagogues in argument because they have depended on their righteous indignation and neglected their homework. (This has happened notably in some of the radio and television discussions in which Senator McCarthy has appeared.)

If a speech is to be of any importance at all, the speaker should live with his theme or message, turning it over and over in his mind. He will be surprised at how many useful illustrations or ways of putting his case will come to him as he walks the street, or reads a newspaper, or gets ready for bed, or wakes up in the morning. Mediocre speaking very often is merely the inevitable and the appropriate reflection of mediocre thinking.

*Thanks to Rudolf Flesch.

or the consequence of imperfect acquaintance with the subject in hand.

But it sometimes happens that speakers who obviously know their subject are too dull to hold attention. Unconsciously they act as if what they were saying hurt or bored them worse than it bored the audience. Interest is contagious, and to arouse interest in his speech a speaker must be interested in it himself. His interest, moreover, must be in what he is saying and its importance, not in his own sufferings while he is speaking.

I am, of course, arguing at this point for the necessity of sincerity on the speaker's part; but also for something more. One must not only believe in what one is saying but also that it matters, especially that it matters to the people to whom one is speaking. If not, why bother?

In everyday conversation, we ordinary folk with no particular genius manage pretty well to convey our own attitudes toward a subject by tone of voice, choice of words, unconscious gestures. Surely there need be no psychological compulsion laid upon us by a platform and an audience to repress any outward manifestation of interest in what presumably we have spent time and trouble preparing for presentation to an audience.

Even worse than apparent boredom with one's own speech is a synthetic enthusiasm: the emphasis of the self-seeking demagogue in politics, or of the salesman advertising cigarettes or cosmetics over the radio or television. We have learned to make allowances for the phony ardors of readers or singers of commercials and even to be amused by them. But it is intolerable when a speaker advances ideas as if he were selling Lucky Strikes.

For years, I have listened when possible to an excellent morning news summary over the radio. It was long sponsored by one coffee company. Then there was a switch to another house selling tea and coffee. Nowadays I listen without conviction to the pleasant voice of the same newscaster as he reads or recites the same extravagant praise of his new sponsor's coffee as formerly of the old. No one is the worse for it—unless perhaps public confidence in the spoken word is unconsciously lowered.

The announcer who deals in commercials has to build up a capacity to feign enthusiasm. I shall never forget the courteous program director of an Illinois station who was called upon in a political campaign to substitute, literally at the last moment, for my designated interrogator. He read admirably the interviewer's part of the script, but with such complete inattention to content that at one point he ignored the break and brightly declaimed his intention to speak at a socialist meeting to be held that night in Chicago. I had to interject, "I thought I was going to do that" —not only to keep the record straight but to save the announcer from a fate almost worse than death at the hands of his ultra-Republican employers.

When the tricks and insincerities of commercials and the manners of successful announcers are transferred to the political platform or the pulpit, you have at best empty elocution, a spurious eloquence, at worst, blatant demagoguery and hypocrisy. That there is so much of this sort of thing goes far to explain the extent of popular cynicism. "The hungry sheep look up and are not fed." And they know it.

In my own experience, about the worst sinners against these conditions of honest and competent public speech which I have been discussing are the lawyers in the relatively small civil and criminal cases under whose efforts I have suffered as a juror. Their occa-

sional attempts at eloquence were phony; their apparent indifference or carelessness in preparing their cases often outrageous. Some of them awoke strong suspicion that they were conniving with perjurers if not suborning perjury. I well remember one case in which we jurors agreed that in our own minds we had about decided for the defendant until we heard his lawyer's closing plea. Even run-of-the-mill political candidates are no worse exemplars of public speaking than these lawyers.

So far, my reflections on public speaking have had to do primarily with the attitude of the speaker to his subject, his material, the information, idea, or message which he wishes to convey. He should seek to be a master of his subject and honestly interested in it. He should first challenge his own statements in his own mind before presenting them to his audience.

And then he should consider his prospective audience. It is a long accepted commonplace that successful speech requires a speaker to come to proper terms with his audience as well as his subject. Success or failure in this respect marks the difference between speaking as a satisfaction—sometimes almost an intoxication—and as a dull and dreary task.

Most reporting of speeches in America is poor. The task is distasteful to reporters. They have learned to depend almost wholly on releases, and it is, properly in most cases, against the rules for a reporter to comment on a public speech as a drama or music critic reports on a performance. That is, perhaps, why I remember with pleasure a phrase in a report of a speech before a college audience: "Mr. Thomas possessed his audience." The speaker is usually aware when something of that sort is happening, even if he never reads it in the daily paper. It is a thrilling feeling, this conviction that you hold an audience even temporarily in your hand. The ability to do it, like other forms of power, offers serious temptation to him who possesses it. He may use it to make an audience into a crowd or a mob. His power has something of a hypnotic quality, independent of the truth or the quality of his ideas. Demagogues and dictators have known and practiced the art at immense cost to humanity.

I remember imperfectly a little book, or series of little books, first published in England, twenty or thirty years ago, in which the authors pictured governments so expert in influencing crowds by sound and color that they could manipulate them for war or peace without any exercise in intelligent speech. As yet, some speech is necessary. But recent history has made it tragically clear that a speaker may catastrophically possess his hearers by iteration, emphasis, appeal to hate or prejudice. So human beings become pawns manipulated to their own ultimate destruction.

If the power to sway men by speech has dangers, it is nevertheless essential for many good ends. The honest speaker is under solemn obligation to use his ability for some honorable purpose outside himself and his own aggrandizement in power. The audience is under obligation to guard its own integrity. It must become a fellowship as distinct from a mob. There is at times a kind of communion of audience and speaker which is the speaker's highest reward. Short of that, there can be a relationship which facilitates the sharing of ideas and emotions. I doubt if any great speech was ever made in which the speaker did not gain inspiration from the audience and the occasion.

In practice, I think I know how to come to satisfactory terms of give-and-take with an audience, although I have

had a wide range of relative success—or failure—in the process. I do not know how to describe the art to my own satisfaction. But some things I can set down with reasonable confidence.

The speaker must always be aware of his audience—that is, of his particular audience—all the more so if he is repeating a much used lecture or speech. He must come to each audience with some anticipatory notion of its probable makeup, attitude, and interest. He should look at his audience; only so can he judge the effect of his speech. He should be prepared to change pace; to indulge in humor—even the wisecrack; to introduce the unexpected, but not the irrelevant. It is not only legitimate but sometimes necessary for a speaker to rephrase and repeat an important fact or opinion until he feels that the audience understands.

It cannot be too strongly insisted that the written and spoken word, while they have much in common, are by no means the same. The speaker is concerned with the particular group before him; he is not speaking to a scattered group of readers or to posterity. Sometimes he can communicate more effectively by repetition, intonation, gesture, unfinished sentence. I have often winced at stenographic reports of speeches which had gone over well enough to receive much applause. But I am convinced that I would have made a mistake to have read a smoother speech.

This indifference to the rules of good writing can be carried too far. A wise speaker will also frequently write out the ideas which he wishes to communicate in form intended to be read, not delivered as a speech. Thus he may improve his vocabulary and his capacity to develop and embellish a theme.

Moreover there are some speeches for some occasions which ought to be written out and read, unless the speaker can memorize accurately and easily what he has written. Speeches in which timing or accuracy of quotation may be vital fall into this category. So may speeches which must convey detailed information, facts, and figures; or speeches on ceremonial occasions when dignity and beauty of language are peculiarly important.

I have a poor photographic memory and early abandoned the attempt to recite written speeches verbatim. I have learned, I think, to read speeches (e.g., over the radio) acceptably. But my hearers and I get more satisfaction when I do not read. The manuscript at best is something of a barrier to communication between speaker and audience. At one time in my youth I wrote out speeches, memorizing only the outline, but trusting that my effort in writing would improve the quality of the speech. I soon found that I was trying so hard to recall what I had thought were felicitous phrasings that I turned my eyes inward instead of looking at my audience. Hence while I have done much writing, it has not been the writing of speeches. As time went on, I discovered that it took an audience to make me think of many of the phrases, especially the wisecracks which proved effective. I can't think of wisecracks cold-bloodedly when looking only at my pen or typewriter. (But once made, I can and do remember and repeat them before different audiences, until I almost gag at their repetition.)

The principles I have been discussing apply to all audiences. The only differences in your style should be appropriate to the audience and the occasion. You may use different sorts of sentences and illustrations before different sorts of audiences, but you don't—if you are wise—talk down to any audience.

It is true, however, that it is harder to find and develop a point of contact with some audiences than others. There is, especially for the speaker who has espoused a minority party or cause, the problem not only of popular apathy and suspicion, but actual hostility. Hostility worries me less than apathy. My chief trouble is to get an audience. Once got, it's not hard to handle it well enough to gain attention, respect, and perhaps a little change in its opinion. I find among speakers and listeners who have talked to me on this subject a tendency to exaggerate difficulties.

I have had meetings involving tests of civil liberty which were broken up by the police. Twice big meetings have been broken up by the violence or threat of violence of relatively small organized mobs. Once at a great Townsend Plan Convention in Cleveland, when I got to criticising the practicability of the plan as it then was presented, I had to settle for an antiphonal arrangement with my audience. I would speak a brief paragraph; the audience would boo; and so on to the relatively orderly end of my argument.

But despite these episodes, I want to bear testimony to the essential courtesy of an American audience. There is no such heckling here as in Britain. (Sometimes I wish there were more.) Any competent speaker can get a hearing even under conditions of great excitement unless there is deliberate organization to silence him.

Meetings can be broken up in one of two ways: first, and most drastically, by an organized mob or sizable group willing to resort to violence. Such a mob won't be sure of winning unless it prevents the speaker from getting any preliminary hold on his audience. The carefully organized mobs in Arkansas and New Jersey which broke up the meetings to which I referred observed this rule.

The second less drastic method is for an organized minority to plant themselves in different parts of a hall under careful instructions, one after the other, to raise a disturbance. I have seen this done by communist and fascist groups comparatively small in numbers, and—it so chanced—not when I myself was speaking. The plaint of spokesmen for minorities that they can't get a fair hearing is true as it applies to difficulties in getting halls or audiences or adequate time on the radio. It is far less true if the difficulty is laid to the hostility of audiences. More often than not, the speaker who suffers from such difficulty is himself largely to blame. He expects trouble and invites it; he whines or he insults his audience. He assumes a greater degree of hostility and fewer points of contact than probably exist. He may have listeners quite willing to be his friends in the audiences which he considers hostile. His audience, especially at the beginning, isn't a unit; it's his business to unite his hearers in a common willingness to give him a chance to state his case. Hostile audiences, or those actively skeptical, are often more rewarding, yes, and more fun, than apathetic audiences or audiences which have heard it all before.

There are various ways of getting along with suspicious or hostile audiences. You can challenge their sense of fair play and their curiosity. You can interest them at the start by beginning with a point at which you and they do agree—perhaps to their surprise—and go on from there.

The average American today inclines to have a rather exaggerated idea that speakers are afraid of something or other, and he is rather easily won to admiration of your courage and frankness in

plain speech. I remember that Billy Sunday at the height of his career, when he was the darling of the local Chambers of Commerce, felt it necessary in order to win the admiration of his audience to conjure up principalities and powers in league against him. And that not in hell, but in Paterson or Philadelphia. (The brewers filled the role most often.) The speaker for an unpopular cause should have less difficulty than the evangelist in presenting himself as David venturing forth against Goliath.

Under almost any circumstances the alert speaker has a tremendous advantage over the single heckler in the audience. That is, unless he loses his temper. Whether in his speech or in answering questions, the speaker may effectively express righteous indignation or maintain judicial calm. But he must be sincere and self-controlled, especially if he is facing a critical or hostile audience. He must remain the master of his emotions *and of his voice.* He mustn't get shrill or, in the vernacular, "blow his top." That will make him a bit ridiculous, which is the worst of fates for a speaker.

Voice and manner were perhaps too much in the foreground of a speaker's thoughts in the old days of elocution and flowing oratory. I suspect that we have gone too far in neglect of them. A sonorous or a beautiful voice is still an asset even in days when a distinctive voice, easily recognized over the radio, is perhaps more prized. At the very least, we have a right to expect speakers to be audible, not to mumble or drop their voices at the end of every sentence. They shouldn't shift all responsibility for audibility to the loud speaker.

I bless my own good fortune that interest in singing and lessons in it taught me something about managing my breath and my voice. If you have learned that, stage fright itself will be shorter-lived and less devastating.

The loud speaker or the public address system is on the whole a blessing. But, as for other blessings, we pay a price for it. I find few public address systems free from mechanical defect; they give speech a metallic sound. In general they tend to reduce all speech to a common denominator of noise. They are a blessing to a speaker in that they give him—whoever he may be—an assurance that he can be heard; they do not guarantee that he will be attentively heard or worth hearing. The habitual inattention of big American conventions, not all of them political, to most speakers droning their way through their manuscripts before a microphone is appalling but very often deserved. Occasionally someone, like Adlai Stevenson at the Chicago convention, shows how the loud speaker and the radio may serve the man who has something to say and knows how to say it—even in a political convention. I am told by an Illinois friend that Mr. Stevenson by no means did so well when he first began to run for office. He learned fast.

The rest of us don't have to wait until we do as well as Mr. Stevenson (or Franklin D. Roosevelt at his best) before we attempt public speech. But we do have an obligation to ourselves, our subject, and our audience, to give as much thought and effort of heart and mind to the business of speaking as we give to our golf or our bridge game or our favorite hobby. And that, I am persuaded, is what a great many speakers, professional as well as amateur, fail to do.

TRUTH AND CONSEQUENCES, OR STANISLAVSKY MISINTERPRETED

Henry Schnitzler

THE Stanislavsky-System — that's where you have to be a vase, isn't it?" This question, recently addressed to me by a student, is symptomatic of the regrettable situation I should like to discuss; a situation which, ironically enough, Stanislavsky foresaw. Shortly before his death, he said to his nurse: "They will distort the truth I've taught them. . . ."[1] Indeed they have. The distortion has resulted in two diametrically opposed, yet interdependent attitudes. According to the first, the Stanislavsky-System is the only valid approach to acting. It provides the magic key which opens the door to any creative achievement in the theatre. It is Holy Writ and therefore not subject to questioning or discussion. According to the second attitude, the Stanislavsky-System is a disastrously theoretical approach to acting. Whoever professes to use it thereby proves that he is an "intellectual" and not a creative artist, because the "real" actor does not need any theories; he "just acts." Moreover, the methods advocated by the System are too ridiculous to be taken seriously anyway.[2]

The interrelation of these two attitudes is obviously and unfortunately one of cause and effect. The self-appointed disciples of Stanislavsky, by transmogrifying the Russian director's teachings into what frequently turns out to be mere caricature, have succeeded in rendering either ludicrous or suspect anyone who as much as mentions their master's name. With a dogmatism matched only by their arrogance, they have obstructed any sane evaluation or application of the "system." The esoteric atmosphere the disciples have been striving to create around their rarefied circles has provoked a reaction, especially among professionals, which, while entirely understandable, is just as appalling and futile as the disciples' own irritating pose of superiority and infallibility.

Stanislavsky never considered himself infallible. To the last day of his life he kept revising and clarifying what he had written. He dreaded the misunderstandings which were likely to result from any attempt to use his books as "texts." He warned that ". . . the system is not a hand-me-down suit that you can put on and walk off in, or a cookbook where all you need is to find the page and there is your recipe."[3] He never asserted that what he had found was the only approach to acting. "If the system does not help you, forget it," he said to Stella Adler. To be sure, Stanislavsky

Henry Schnitzler, Assistant Professor in Theatre Arts on the Los Angeles campus of the University of California, is a student of acting, directing, drama, and music.

[1] David Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life* (London, 1950), p. 394.

[2] For a characteristic expression of this view, see Cornelia Otis Skinner, "Actors Just Act—Or No 'Pear-Shaped Tones,'" *New York Times Magazine* (December 13, 1942). See also Aline B. Louchheim, "Three-Time Winner; Leora Dana, of 'Point of No Return,' Has Not Played in a Broadway Failure," *New York Times* (Drama Section) (December 30, 1951). There, the reader is told that Miss Charlotte Perry "just wanted naturalness and honesty of playing. She taught you to recognize when you were wrong. No Stanislavsky stuff, no agonizing." The implication is that Stanislavsky was opposed to naturalness and honesty of playing!

[3] Constantin Stanislavsky, *Building a Character* (New York, 1949), p. 282.

added: "But perhaps you do not use it properly."[4] For he knew that his training method, if distorted, might do more harm than good. When he decided to set down in writing the sum total of his experience, he did so, as he confessed in a letter to Maxim Gorki, with great reluctance.[5] He explained, however, that it was "necessary, if only because it would put an end to all the silly talk about my so-called 'system,' which, in the form it is taught now, merely cripples the actor."[6] After the book had been published, he was shocked to realize that it had apparently made things worse. Vladimir Sokoloff, the noted actor, told me of a discussion he once had with Stanislavsky on the problems involved in training for the stage. At one point, Sokoloff referred to the book we know under the title *An Actor Prepares*. Stanislavsky reacted with a start and said: "Don't mention this book to me; and never give it to a student."

For a considerable number of years now, many of us have listened to the silly talk Stanislavsky wished to stop, and seen some of the crippling effects he feared. Since I cannot deal here with all implications of the appallingly voluminous material I have gathered, I must limit my remarks to a few pertinent illustrations. These are, I am afraid, typical of a state of things which makes not only a freshman student but also others who ought to know better, identify the Stanislavsky-System with "having to be a vase." The examples I am going to use are, without exception, based on personal observation and not on hearsay. I have to emphasize this because some incidents might seem as incredible to the reader as they did to me when I experienced them.

The obvious way to contradict the misinterpretations would be to quote from Stanislavsky's books. For reasons of space, however, I must omit many of the quotations which may serve this purpose. I realize, with regret, that this omission may make the following remarks somewhat lopsided, since more attention will be given to the distortions and their consequences than to an appraisal of the conspicuous merits Stanislavsky's methods possess. I also regret that it will not be possible to describe those instances where the use of the System has been based on the sound advice given by Stanislavsky himself when he said to Joshua Logan: "If something excites you, use it, apply it to yourselves, but adapt it. Do not try to copy it. Let it make you think further."[7] The Group Theatre, the Actors' Studio, and several other examples could be quoted to show how such "thinking further" may be done constructively. The misinterpreters have also "thought further" but, unfortunately, not always in the right direction.

What has enabled me to come to some conclusions as to where the right direction may be, was a personal experience which I cherish more than many another experience in the theatre. I was fortunate enough to attend twenty-eight performances of the Moscow Art Theatre, among them *The Lower Depths*, *Uncle Vanya*, *The Cherry Orchard*, *Three Sisters*, *The Brothers Karamazov*, and *Hamlet*. Some of the plays mentioned I saw

[4] Harold Clurman, *The Fervent Years: The Story of the Group Theatre and the Thirties* (New York, 1945), p. 138.

[5] It may be useful to remember in this context that Stanislavsky started to develop his System around 1906, at the age of forty-three; eight years after the foundation of the Moscow Art Theatre and after almost thirty years of practical work as actor and director. Cf. Constantin Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art* (Boston, 1938), pp. 458 ff.

[6] Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, pp. 383 f.

[7] Joshua Logan, "Introduction," in Stanislavsky, *Building a Character*, p. xv.

ation of this kind—is indeed not here to give but to get, but hardly in the theatre.

The confusion resulting from this sort of misrepresentation has had disturbing consequences. The misguided actor will act for himself, in the sense that he evaluates his participation in a play solely according to the personal benefit he may derive from it. To make things worse, there are directors who feel encouraged to regard their own job in no other way. A few years ago, I was occasionally invited to attend the meetings held by a group of young actors who had just made a successful start toward the setting up of a permanent repertory company in a large city. One day a meeting was called to deal with the following emergency: after having rehearsed one of Ibsen's plays for more than three weeks, the director suddenly quit. To justify his startling decision, he explained that he did not feel like doing this particular play at this particular time. Repeated attempts to remind the young egotist of his obligations toward the members of the cast, toward the group as a whole, and toward their audiences, proved futile. The director had found out that Ibsen's play could not at the moment contribute anything to the solution of his personal problems; therefore, away with it! After the "To-Hell-With-The-Audience" attitude, mentioned before, we now have the "To-Hell-With-The-Play" attitude. The story may be said to provide a variation on the theme sounded at the Ouspenskaya school, since, in this instance, the director obviously was not here to give but to get.

Emphasizing that communication is achieved by external form, Stanislavsky never tired of pointing out that to attain that form the actor needs "external technique."[21] Logically enough, where there is no concern with communication, there can be no concern with external technique, including its fundamentals, speech and movement. However, Stanislavsky's book *Building a Character* is devoted almost entirely to a detailed discussion of these very fundamentals which—one hesitates to utter a truism such as this—have been regarded for centuries as the cornerstones of the actor's craft.[22] The misinterpreters, on the other hand, seem to tell us, to use the familiar line spoken by one of Molière's doctors: *"Nous avons changé tout cela."*[23] I suspect that one of the motivations for pretending to have changed all that may be the desire, perhaps not even a conscious one, to hide dilettantism and incompetence behind a smoke screen of half-digested misinformation.

External technique implies control, a fact of which Stanislavsky was very much aware. Thus he proved once again that he did not confuse "living the part" with "living." The following quotations from his writings may serve as illustrations: "I divided myself, as it were, into two personalities. One continued as an actor, the other was an observer. Strangely enough this duality not only did not impede, it actually promoted my creative work. It encouraged and lent impetus to it."[24] "The more restraint and self control an actor exercises in this creative process the clearer will be the form and design of his role and the more power-

[21] Cf. Stanislavsky, *Building a Character*, pp. 263 ff.

[22] See especially Chapters I, II, III, IV, V, VII, VIII, and IX, of *Building a Character*.

[23] Molière, *Le Médecin Malgré Lui*, II, 4, *Oeuvres Complètes*, Edition de la Pléiade (Paris, n.d.), II, 132. The complete sentence, applicable in its entirety to the present subject, reads as follows: *"Oui, cela était autrefois ainsi; mais nous avons changé tout cela, et nous faisons maintenant la médecine d'une méthode toute nouvelle."*

[24] Stanislavsky, *Building a Character*, p. 19.

ful its effect on the public."[25] To emphasize the essential duality of the actor, Stanislavsky quotes Tommaso Salvini's statement: "An actor lives, weeps, laughs on the stage, but as he weeps and laughs he observes his own tears and mirth. It is this double existence, this balance between life and acting that makes for art."[26]

The necessity of employing external technique demands that the actor become a superior craftsman. It is hardly necessary to point out that Stanislavsky was fully aware of the importance of craftsmanship in the theatre. "There is no art that does not demand virtuosity," he wrote; and added:

> There is no final measure for the fullness of this virtuosity. The French painter Degas said, "If you own a hundred thousand francs' worth of craftsmanship, spend five sous to buy more." This necessity for the acquirement of experience and craftsmanship is especially apparent in the art of the theatre.[27]

And again:

> . . . the creativeness of an actor must come from within, while his voice and his body remain obedient instruments in the sure hands of a virtuoso. There is trouble when a violin has a false tone. No matter how well the violinist feels, he cannot interpret what he feels.[28]

Yet there are teachers who, abusing Stanislavsky's name, encourage the disregard of external technique. In a university production which I attended several years ago, the girl playing the leading part kept yelling at the top of her voice throughout the entire play. When the director later asked me what I thought of the performance, I could not help mentioning the young lady's irritatingly monotonous shouting. The reply I received from this proud follower of Stanislavsky was so disarming that it stunned me into silence: "Yes, wasn't it awful?" he said.

In Stanislavsky's books, however, he could have found the following pertinent comments:

> Do not take as your models the actors who think they are showing power when it is only loudness. Loudness is not power, it is only loudness and shouting.[29]

> As for loudness as such there is scarcely any use for it at all on the stage. In the great majority of cases it serves no purpose except to deafen those who have no understanding of art.[30]

Another director, also known to adhere to the Stanislavsky method, discussed with me his production of a nineteenth-century drama which frequently, and for valid reasons, has been termed a forerunner of Expressionism in the theatre. When I remarked that, in my opinion, the peculiar, hectic style of the play had been obscured by a naturalistic, leisurely treatment applied to speech as well as movement, I received the reply: "I know, but I didn't want to interfere."

The two stories, aside from revealing a generous contempt for bothersome details such as speech and movement, that is, of external technique, also imply a rather strange view of the director's function in the theatre. The director, so it seems, must not direct. If the actors yell, let them yell! If they fail to grasp the play's style, don't interfere!

And if, as a result of such lack of direction, the audience walks out on your production, don't blame yourself; blame the poor taste of the public and its inability to appreciate really fine theatre. A young director once told me cheerfully and with an air of undisguised superiority that half of the audience had left the theatre after the second act of his production of a play by George Bernard Shaw. I cautiously suggested that, rather than the public, certain aspects of the performance might be

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 72.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 167.
[27] Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art*, p. 570.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 70.
[29] Stanislavsky, *Building a Character*, p. 140.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

blamed for the embarrassing situation. In the course of the ensuing discussion, I used the word "showmanship." There was an awkward silence and the expression on the faces around me made me realize that I had used a dirty word. By suggesting anything as low-brow as "showmanship," I had proved beyond doubt that my views were just about on a par with those held by the manager of a burlesque show.[31]

A further consequence of the contention that the director must not direct is the notion that he must not plan his blocking since, by so doing, he would stifle the actor's creativity. Watching the run-through of a university production, I noticed with considerable surprise that, precisely two days prior to the opening night, the blocking of some scenes had not been worked out. Several times, the actors were compelled to stop the rehearsal, in order to reach a hurried agreement as to what chairs they were going to use next. The director, by no means an inexperienced beginner but a devotee of what he thought to be the Stanislavsky-System, did not interfere but watched with apparent satisfaction the creative mess on stage.

Fortunately, Stanislavsky's own directing methods may be studied not merely in some of his books but also in numerous revealing descriptions written either by his collaborators or by visitors who were permitted to attend rehearsals. While this is not the place to analyze his techniques in detail, they may be summed up by stating that he did plan the blocking for his productions; that he did "interfere" with his actors; that he did not only suggest but even demonstrate movements and gestures; in short, that, being a director, he directed.

The evolution of Stanislavsky's directing method led from his beginnings as a "producer-autocrat" who virtually turned his actors into puppets,[32] to the approach we may study in his published director's script for *The Sea Gull*,[33] and, finally, to the time when he usually refrained from writing down his production plan. "This does not mean," Norris Houghton assures us, "that the production is allowed to take its own course. All during the preceding period he has had in mind the pattern of his play; he must have thought out all problems of movement and emotion in advance if he is to be of any help to his actors at all. All this he carries in his mind, however. There is nothing on paper."[34] How precisely the pattern of a production was established in his mind becomes abundantly clear when one studies the production plan for *Othello*, which owes its existence to circumstances where Stanislavsky was once again compelled to commit his ideas to paper.[35]

Far from adopting the strange attitude expressed by the director who did not want to "interfere," Stanislavsky continuously did just that. "When rehearsals are held on the stage, the director is constantly there with the actors; he does not sit out front. Throughout this period he seems only to be trying to help the actors. He walks about with them on the stage, whispers suggestions to stir their imaginations."[36] These suggestions were mainly concerned with physical actions; never with psychological states or emotions. ". . . if you suggest

[31] Stanislavsky was not only a superb "showman" but also quite willing to employ what he himself considered "stale" and "cheap" tricks, as long as they contributed to the effectiveness of a scene; cf. *The Sea Gull Produced by Stanislavsky*, ed. S. D. Balukhaty, trans. David Magarshack (London, 1952), p. 283.

[32] Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, p. 174.

[33] Cf. above, note 31.

[34] Norris Houghton, *Moscow Rehearsals: An Account of Methods of Production in the Soviet Theatre* (New York, 1936), p. 78.

[35] Cf. *Stanislavsky Produces Othello*, trans. Helen Nowak (London, 1948).

[36] Houghton, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

that (the actor) make certain movements and then ask him to feel as these movements dictate, you will perhaps arrive at a truer combination of psychology and action."[37] Stanislavsky was therefore well aware that demonstration may be a valuable tool for the director. It might consist of mere suggestion: "Just a slight change of posture and his huge figure would suddenly become transformed."[38] However, demonstration might also become quite explicit, as it did at an opera rehearsal where Stanislavsky showed the singers "bits of movement."[39] In short, he never denied the active function of the director in the theatre: "Collective creation in art without a finally dominating hand is impossible and the Art Theatre knows it."[40]

To what comic, even farcical, situations the misreading of Stanislavsky's thought can lead, may be illustrated by the following episode. About to start rehearsals for a university production, the director issued a decree prohibiting the members of the cast from watching any scenes in which they were not actually appearing. For if they did, he argued, they would become conscious of participating in a stage play and, consequently, be hampered in carrying out the task of "living the part." Announcing this novel procedure, the director undoubtedly felt that he had acted in sincere agreement with Stanislavsky's often quoted statement: "I began to hate the theatre in the theatre."[41] It apparently never occurred to him, however, that by thus out-Stanislavskying Stanislavsky, he turned a sound principle into hilarious nonsense. There was no need for this particular disciple to prove that he hated the theatre in the theatre since, by a *tour de force* of rare dexterity, he had managed to obliterate the theatre altogether. Moreover, if he had listened to his master's voice more carefully, he would have heard the following statement: "We hate the theatre in the theatre, we love the scenic on the stage. That is a tremendous difference."[42] Moreover, in Stanislavsky's essay on Ethics, he would have found a passage scorning actors who, during the rehearsal period, pay no attention to the scenes in which they do not appear.[43]

Aside from perverting Stanislavsky's thought, the self-appointed disciples have fostered in their fellow worshipers an attitude of arrogance which I have had the dubious privilege to observe more than once. The following experience may again serve as an illustration. Answering a student's question concerning theatrical training methods in Europe, I once explained to a class that the Stanislavsky-System was little known abroad since most of his books were not available in translations.[44] Having ob-

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 74; for detailed information on the Method of Physical Actions, see K. S. Stanislawski, W. Prokofjew, W. Toporkow, B. Sachawa, G. Gurjew, *Der schauspielerische Weg zur Rolle; Fuenf Aufsaetze ueber Stanislawskis "Methode der physischen Handlungen,"* trans. B. Ensslen, K. Fend, K. A. Paffen (Berlin, 1952); and W. Toporkow, *K. S. Stanislawski bei der Probe*, trans. Karl Fend (Berlin, 1952).

[38] Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, p. 376.

[39] Houghton, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[41] Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art*, p. 207.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

[43] In the pertinent passage, Stanislavsky derides actors "whose attitude toward their work lacks understanding to such an extent that they listen during rehearsals only to those remarks which immediately concern their own parts. Scenes in which they don't appear are completely neglected by them." Cf. K. S. Stanislawski, *Ethik*, trans. Peter von Hamm (Berlin, 1950); my translation of the above passage is based on the German version. An abstract of Stanislavsky's essay may be found, under the title *Stage Ethics*, as "Appendix I" in *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, pp. 287 ff. (See note 12).

[44] The statement would be erroneous today, but was entirely correct eleven years ago, when the incident occurred. At that time, no translations of Stanislavsky's writings existed except the English versions of *An Actor Prepares* (1936) and *My Life in Art* (1938); and selected passages from the autobiography, translated into French by Nina Gourfinkel and Léon

tained this information, the student remarked, with a sneer he did not try to conceal: "Then acting in Europe must be pretty external." Thus, what may be called the Great Tradition of acting was arrogantly and ignorantly swept aside in one sentence spoken by a young man who fancied himself as a follower of Stanislavsky. Betterton and Garrick, Lekain and Talma, Rachel and Salvini, Duse and Coquelin, not to mention the innumerable actors of our own day who are unable to read Stanislavsky's writings—all are "pretty external," since those wretched hams were never enlightened by the System! It is known, on the other hand, that Stanislavsky eagerly studied the achievements and methods of the great actors of the past, with that humble awareness of traditional values so characteristic of most reformers.[45]

The misinterpreters, and not Stanislavsky, must also be held responsible for the notion that the System is indeed "where you have to be a vase." Confused students have come to me wondering why they were asked by instructors professing to teach the Stanislavsky method, to "be" a loaf of bread, a doorknob, an ice cream soda, a teakettle, and what not. Those who did not come were presumably convinced that they had now joined the ranks of the initiated. I once beheld a paper written as an assignment for an acting class and beginning with the words: "I am a glacier." I did not venture any further into that essay although I have no doubt that I would have been rewarded by fascinating revelations regarding the glacier's family background, political views, and sex life.

There is nothing in Stanislavsky's writings—at least as far as these are available in English, German, or French—to support such pernicious monkeyshine. The familiar passage in *An Actor Prepares*, where one of "Tortsov's" students is asked to "live the life of a tree" is, above all, an isolated instance;[46] secondly, the context makes it clear that this exercise is used merely as a stimulant for the imagination or, to use the terminology of the System, as a lever for Stanislavsky's magic "if"; finally, the tree, after all, is a living thing and not an inanimate object.[47]

Such methods, conspicuous by their very absurdity, have done more than anything else to bring the Stanislavsky System into disrepute and to expose it to ridicule.

> Be a tree, be a sled,
> Be a purple spool of thread,
> Be a storm, a piece of lace,
> A subway train, an empty space . . .

These lines were sputtered by Danny Kaye in a New York night club more than ten years ago. *Time*, quoting them in a story on the celebrated comedian,

Chancerel, and published, with a preface by Jacques Copeau, under the title, *Ma Vie dans l'Art* (Paris, 1934).

[45] On Stanislavsky's acquaintance with, and interest in, the writings of Luigi Riccoboni, Francesco Riccoboni, Talma, Clairon, Dumésnil, Eckhof, and Iffland, see Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, pp. 336 f; the same author, in his "Introduction" in *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, p. 86, emphasizes that "Stanislavsky always claimed that his system was based on his observations of the methods of great actors."

[46] Stanislavsky, *An Actor Prepares* (New York, 1936), pp. 61 ff.

[47] It is significant to find that serious followers of Stanislavsky are refuting erroneous experiments along these lines. In a recent German manual of acting, admittedly based on the Stanislavsky System, the example of the tree is discussed, with the pointed comment that it does not mean an attempt to "portray a tree." "We decidedly refute any such humanization of Nature. We do not act animals either. Such erroneous paths, to be sure, have been followed in some Stanislavsky studios." (Ottofritz Gaillard, *Das deutsche Stanislawski-Buch: Lehrbuch der Schauspielkunst nach dem Stanislawski-System* (Berlin, 1946), p. 104 (my translation). Similarly, the late Charles Dullin, discussing the value of animal images for the development of bodily rhythm, warns prospective teachers: *"Ne pas laisser l'élève imiter le chat mais l'inciter à traduire les images par une plastique humaine"*; cf. Charles Dullin, *Souvenirs et Notes de Travail d'un Acteur* (Paris, 1946), p. 118.

remarked by way of explanation that the song was supposed to kid the Stanislavsky-System where students of the drama were taught to do this kind of thing. This notion of Stanislavsky's educational methods was, at any rate, taken for granted by Sylvia Kaye, who wrote the lyric, since she chose as its persuasive title simply the name "Stanislavsky."[48]

To investigate whether Stanislavsky himself may not have provided some of the reasons for the misinterpretations I have tried to indicate would require a separate study. Certain aspects of his theory have indeed been criticized on various grounds and in some instances such criticism has been justified. However, there is a difference between serious analysis, on one side, and either spellbound adoration or irresponsible ridicule on the other.[49]

Yet there are other circumstances which have facilitated misrepresentation and misunderstanding. Since the pertinent facts are not generally known, it might be helpful to survey them briefly. The primary source for any study of Stanislavsky's ideas is, of course, his writings. Are we reading what he wanted us to read? I am afraid we are not, for his books have been presented to the English-speaking public in a rather dubious state for which translators, editors, and publishers must share the blame. A cursory review of the most conspicuous instances must suffice.

Stanislavsky began to write his autobiography, *My Life in Art*, during his stay in the United States in 1923. Rushed by a contract with his American publisher, he completed the book within a few months and under conditions which caused him to report to a friend: ". . . I am forced to write things I should not have written in normal circumstances."[50] His biographer tells us that he then ". . . spent over a year on its Russian edition and so thoroughly revised it that when it was published in 1925, it was practically a different work."[51] What some of us have been reading, therefore, is not what Stanislavsky himself considered the final version of his autobiography.

An Actor Prepares,[52] the most widely read and used of Stanislavsky's books, is a mere fragment. Besides, the complete work, published in Russia after Stanislavsky's death in 1938, that is, two years later than *An Actor Prepares*, bears an entirely different title, namely, *Actor and Self: Personal Work in the Creative Process of Re-Living*.[53] The text is almost three times as extensive as that of the book we have been reading under the title *An Actor Prepares*.

[48] *Time*, (March 11, 1946), 66.

[49] In his "Introduction" in *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, Magarshack remarks (p. 86): "The chief error of Stanislavsky's critics is to ascribe to him a rigidity of method he himself denounced. This is mainly due to Stanislavsky's followers who, in teaching his system, cannot see the wood for the trees. But it is unjust to saddle Stanislavsky with the mistakes of his followers whom he himself repeatedly condemned." For serious criticism of the System, see Theodore Komisarjevsky, *Myself and the Theatre* (New York, 1930), pp. 134 ff; Nicolas Evreinoff, *Histoire du Théâtre Russe* (Paris, 1947), pp. 3066 ff; Edwin Duerr, "Stanislavsky and the Idea" in *Studies in Speech and Drama, in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1944), pp. 31 ff.

[50] Magarshack, *Stanislavsky. A Life*, p. 367.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 368. Unable to read Russian, I welcomed the opportunity of verifying this claim by checking the recently published German translation of the final version of Stanislavsky's autobiography, *Mein Leben in der Kunst*, trans. Klaus Roose (Berlin, 1951); compared to *My Life in Art*, it is indeed "a different work."

[52] See note 46.

[53] The final authentic version is available in German under the title: *Das Geheimnis des schauspielerischen Erfolges*, trans. Alexandra Meyenburg (Zurich, n.d.). If the rights can be cleared, it may eventually be available in an English version prepared by Mr. John W. Volkoff, Berkeley, California, who was kind enough to put at my disposal not only a typewritten copy of his translation but also numerous notes which helped to clarify the problems involved.

In a preface, Stanislavsky outlines his projected treatise on acting, which was to consist of three parts. He emphasizes that the present volume deals merely with the actor's preparatory work and not with problems of rehearsal and performance. As to this obviously very important limitation, even the incorrect title of the available English version ought to have provided a hint, since it reads *An Actor* PREPARES, and not *An Actor* PERFORMS. I am convinced that many of the current misinterpretations of Stanislavsky's System have been caused by the failure, on the part of overzealous readers, to realize the significance of this distinction. If one takes the first part of Stanislavsky's work, in an incomplete version at that, as representing the entire System, one is bound to misconceive the total pattern so carefully planned by its creator. Hypnotized by what Stanislavsky had to say about the actor's preparatory work, which naturally is not concerned with problems of performance, students are misled into being preoccupied with the "Self," while neglecting the all-important relationship between actor and audience. Therefore, communication and its basis, external technique, are believed to be irrelevant. This notion, although entirely absent from Stanislavsky's thought, has had dismal consequences and is largely responsible for the misrepresentation of his System. Indicative of the resulting confusion are attitudes such as that of the instructor who claims that "We do not want to express emotions, we only want to originate them"; of the director who tells an actor: "Just feel it"; and the corresponding one of the actress who "does not care" whether the emotion she had tried to convey reached her audience as long as she "felt it."

Some of the material Stanislavsky wanted to include in the remaining two volumes of his treatise was published in the United States under the title *Building a Character*.[54] In view of the significance of this material, one finds with regret that the editorial methods employed in its publication leave much to be desired. Aside from a hasty reference in the translator's "Explanatory Note" to the effect that the editorial task "consisted mainly of choosing among the various versions of given chapters which had come to hand,"[55] we are not given any information as to exact sources of the book's contents. Indicative of a surprising lack of editorial care is the chapter called "Toward An Ethics of the Theatre."[56] This turns out to be an incomplete rendering of the various drafts for an essay bearing the title *Ethics* which Stanislavsky began to write in 1908 and on which he was still working during his last illness in 1938. According to the Russian editors, the essay was originally intended as one chapter of *Actor and Self*. However, Stanislavsky considered it so important that he decided to remove it from his treatise on acting and to deal with the subject in a separate book.[57]

Another publication available in English, *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, although edited by Stanislavsky's biographer, David Magarshack, is not entirely reliable either.[58] Above all, the author of the book's main portions, titled "The System and Methods of Creative Art" and "Five Rehearsals of 'Werther'" respectively, is not, as this edition would make one believe, Stanislavsky, but the singer, K. Antarova, who based her book on notes taken during her attendance at

[54] See note 3.
[55] Stanislavsky, *Building a Character*, p. ix.
[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 242 ff.
[57] *The Yearbook of the Moscow Art Theatre, 1944*, (Moscow, 1946), I, 25 ff. A German translation of the entire essay is now available: see note 43.
[58] See note 12.

Stanislavsky's acting classes between 1918 and 1922, and during the rehearsals for Stanislavsky's studio production of Massenet's opera. Not only has the author's name been omitted but also two entire chapters, one of them containing a vivid description of Stanislavsky's working methods.[59]

The sad conclusion is that neither translators, nor editors, nor publishers have made it easy for us to follow Stanislavsky's line of thought. Moreover, as indicated before, Stanislavsky himself is at times not too helpful either. His books contain occasional inconsistencies and puzzling applications of aesthetic as well as psychological terms. To be sure, his biographer tells us that "he frequently changed his ideas about the importance of certain elements of his system."[60]

Yet the basic assumptions on which he based his methods are sound. As a matter of fact, the System is neither a revelation, nor is it nonsense. As Norris Houghton has pointed out, it is "really only a conscious codification of ideas about acting which have always been the property of most good actors of all countries whether they knew it or not."[61] Even Theodore Komisarjevsky, who completely refutes the System, wrote: . . . whatever the errors Stanislavsky was led into by his theories, he has nevertheless by his system laid the foundation stone for the construction in future of a true inner expression of the art of the stage, and has erected certain signposts which every genuine actor has to follow, if he does not want to be a mere grimacing clown.[62]

During a lecture demonstration given at a recent Conference of the Southern California Section of the American Educational Theatre Association, some of the participants were asked to improvise a scene. Ascending the platform, one of the volunteer actors, himself the chairman of a department of dramatic art at a distinguished institution of higher learning, turned to the audience with the quip: "What's my background, so that I can Stanislavsky myself into it?" Roaring laughter was the response to this flippant remark.

One may wonder, however, whether it is indeed amusing to see the name of an artist as eminent and consequential as Constantin Stanislavsky first turned into a laughingstock for the benefit of snickering night club customers; then taken as cue for a belly laugh elicited from an audience composed of teachers of dramatic art. Should we allow reactions such as these to become the consequences of Stanislavsky's truth? Should we permit this to be the career of Stanislavsky's memory in the United States?

"A good idea, badly shown, dies for a long time," he wrote.[63] His good idea has been shown so badly that it appears to be moribund. Yet it must not be allowed to die under the busy hands of his misinterpreters. Stanislavsky has indeed become, as Michael Redgrave put it, "the subject of such violent discussion, mystic adoration, wholly unreasonable dislike, or suspiciously lofty indif-

[59] Aside from David Magarshack's "Introduction," which provides an excellent appraisal of the entire System, additional material is included in two Appendices; the first being an abstract of Stanislavsky's essay on *Ethics* (see note 43); the second, consisting of excerpts from the reminiscences of N. Gorchakov, one of the directors of the Moscow Art Theatre, under the title *Melodrama: A Stanislavsky Improvisation*. K. Antarova's book is available in German under the title *Studioarbeit mit Stanislawski: Dreissig Gespraeche ueber System und Elemente schoepferischer Arbeit und fuenf Gespraeche ueber die Arbeit an der Oper "Werther" von Massenet*, trans. Peter von Hamm (Berlin, 1950).

[60] **Magarshack**, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, p. 380.

[61] **Houghton**, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

[62] Quoted by Magarshack, in his "Introduction" in *Stanislavsky on the Art of the Stage*, p. 84.

[63] Stanislavsky, *My Life in Art*, p. 438.

ference, that it is hard to get people to look at the facts of the case."[64]

A few days before Stanislavsky's death, one of the directors of the Art Theatre came to his home to inquire about his health. The bedroom door was open and the visitor saw Stanislavsky sitting in his bed, propped up on high pillows. His eyes were closed and, breathing heavily, he blurted out sentences. This is what the visitor heard: "Silence! I don't believe it! Can't hear your words! Repeat it!" Thus, in a last effort as it were, Stanislavsky tried to sum up his artistic creed: "I don't believe it!"—his persistent search for truth and sincerity in acting; "Can't hear your words!"—his untiring concern with communication and its basis, external technique; "Repeat it!"—his fanatic devotion to work, work, and more work. These, in a nutshell, are the fundamental elements of Stanislavsky's System. These are the facts of the case. Although they have become obscured by the unfortunate consequences of persistent misinterpretation, we can hardly afford to ignore their simple truth.

[64] Michael Redgrave, "The Stanislavsky Myth," in *Actors on Acting: The Theories, Techniques, and Practices of the Great Actors of All Times as Told in Their Own Words*, ed. Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy (New York, 1949), p. 386.

[65] Magarshack, *Stanislavsky: A Life*, p. 403.

MACREADY'S INNOVATIONS AS PRODUCER

But more than this, the production as well as the star must convey the idea of a complete unity. Accuracy of detail in setting and costume, carefully drilled performances by the entire company, including the supernumeraries, dimming of the lights when mood and atmosphere demanded, these were Macready's innovations as a producer. Star performer though he was, he was enough of an artist to realize that the greatest effect had been lost by those of his great predecessors who were content if their own star performances brought hysterical applause. As an artist, Macready felt that the function of the drama was moral instruction. To implement this function in *Macbeth*, he concentrated on the creation of a background of royal and barbaric splendour that the archcriminal's fall from grace might be the more impressive. That it might be the more convincing, he further attempted to *humanize* the characters, for as one of the Victorian critics declared, "A subject *to come home to the hearts and bosoms of men* must be of a domestic nature." Finally, that the hearts and bosoms might become more surely moved, he made liberal use (though not as overliberal as many of his successors) of the mechanics of the theater—sound effects, music, painting, and light.

If this seems theatrical commonplace, it must be remembered that both Garrick and Kean were content to play in whatever costumes and sets were available, that Kemble's attention to historical accuracy in production scarcely went as far as drilling the supernumeraries, and that Mme. Vestris' experiments in staging were for the most part confined to drawing room comedy. In his constant emphasis on the necessity for *unity* in production Macready foreshadowed the modern régisseur.

Alan S. Downer, "Macready's Production of Macbeth," *QJS*, XXXIII (1947), 181.

THE CASE AGAINST SPEECH: AN EXAMINATION OF CRITICAL VIEWPOINTS

Carroll C. Arnold

THE historian and educational reformer, H. A. L. Fisher, wrote in the Preface to his *History of Europe:* "The fact of progress is written plain and large on the page of history; but progress is not a law of nature. The ground gained by one generation may be lost by the next."[1] Whether this be the single great lesson of history, we need not debate here, but it is a conclusion closely supported by the uneven course of speech as an academic discipline. Even in America's brief past the tradition of Adams, Rush, Channing, and Goodrich shriveled in the hands of the less wise, less humane elocutionists; and flowered again only when men like Baker, Winans, O'Neill, Woolbert, and others returned to the older traditions and gave them a new, vigorous, catholic exposition.

But now a new generation holds in stewardship the academic discipline we call speech. Its legitimacy has been demonstrated by many; yet its place of comfort and sodality among the traditional areas of study has not been everywhere achieved, nor is it the law of nature that such a place shall be achieved. What dignity speech will acquire in the next forty years and what contributions it will offer to man's knowledge of man will surely depend in large part upon the wisdom with which we direct its growth and form its maturer features. It is, then, only the part of good sense to inquire, periodically, into the premises of those who doubt the value of formal instruction in speech, for

> . . . if we look more closely, we shall find
> Most have the seeds of judgment in their mind.

It has, indeed, been the history of our subject that its critics have often seen, as its friends have not, distortions of purpose which debase, and excesses of specialization which demoralize.

Almost every member of our profession can testify from personal acquaintance that there are those in our schools and colleges who, though willing to admit speech to the educational scullery, would deny it the more dignified associations of the academic parlor. To such persons speech seems an educational "extra." When their lines of thought and argument are traced, these critical attitudes are usually found to be rooted in one of two general convictions or premises:

Speech is a special subject, chiefly remedial or artistic, and is, therefore, important only to the seriously deficient and the especially gifted;

or

Speech is not a true subject at all but an assortment of special activities which may be properly and adequately provided outside the regular academic schedule.

I think it is important to observe that both of these assumptions involve an identification of speech with dramatics, voice and diction, declamation, speech correction, debate, or other fragments and special activities connected with our general discipline. This identification of a part with the whole is likely to be

Carroll C. Arnold (Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1942) is Associate Professor of Speech at Cornell University. He is particularly interested in Discussion and British Public Address.

[1] (Boston, 1935), I, vii.

hides its face between the covers of great books or sinks from sight amid the intricacies of general semantics or psychology, and interpretative and dramatic communication masquerades in the costume of literary criticism. But when critics have scorned the content of a physiology that breathes but cannot walk, have questioned the value of an incidental or haphazard treatment of the world's great ideas, or have disparaged a literary criticism which limits itself to the readable and playable masterpieces, little answer has been possible. These strivings for status among the liberal studies seldom have established speech as a respected independent field of study: for when wearing the raiment of other disciplines, speech conceals its own distinctive substance and character.

Another, more popular answer to those who question the importance and general respectability of speech is that better public relations and administrative or legislative action are the means by which we may overwhelm our critics. During the past academic year I have seen sixteen different proposals from sixteen different persons or groups calling for "more publicity about what we're doing" and for "requiring every school to hire at least one speech teacher." But we are not yet prepared to say precisely what speech *is* when we issue our publicity, or memorialize our Departments of Education, or clutch the lapel of an Assemblyman. If we were prepared to expound our subject as a cohesive body of historical, theoretical, and practical knowledge concerning the unique processes and problems which attend Speaking Man's effort to command the understanding of Listening Man, our case before our colleagues and the public would surely be stronger. Who then could say we borrow what others already teach or that a knowledge of our subject is not substantive, humane, and liberating?

The three basic premises of contemporary resistance to full and ample speech programs in general education arise from a deep-seated conviction that training must not be identified with education, drill with study, or neuromuscular co-ordination with knowledge. These are, it seems to me, the "seeds of judgment" in the complaints of those who allege that ours is a special subject, or no subject, or at least not a liberal subject. Though they magnify our excesses and our omissions, our critics serve us well, for they warn against the practices which may undermine the academic status gained through the wisdom of a now-retiring generation of able teachers and theorists.

The contentions of our critics are not new. Neither are the failings to which they call attention original with us. The age, the cause, and perhaps the refutation of the case against speech are all suggested in the concluding paragraph of Charles Sears Baldwin's *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic*:

> The ancient experience with rhetoric and with poetic is seen in retrospect as typical. The theory of rhetoric as the energizing of knowledge and the humanizing of truth is explicitly the philosophy of Aristotle and implicitly that of Cicero, Tacitus, Quintilian. What the later ancient professors of rhetoric had rather in mind is the training of immediate personal effectiveness: and this theory of rhetoric as the art of the speaker is at once as old as the other and as permanent. Its name is sophistic. Aristotle deprecated it in his first chapter; St. Augustine turned his back on it at the end of the ancient world; but meantime it had been for centuries, and it has been again and again, a popular pedagogy.[5]

The case of the modern critics of speech, like Plato's case against the rhetoricians of his day, is an attack upon the pedagogy of sophistic applied to the steadily

[5] (New York, 1924), p. 247.

multiplying uses of speech in the modern world. Against admitting the technologies of debate, broadcasting, stagecraft, or clinical practice to general education, the case of the ancient and modern critics has historical and contemporary validity. Against accrediting as general education such subjects as the nature and methods of argumentative discourse, dramatic representation, or the evolution and development of speech and language (to name but a few possibilities), the contentions of doubters are powerless.

Wherever students may come to understand the geographical, social, and conventional influences which have formed and daily change the talk of their communities, there we may point with confidence to a portion of the liberal content and method of speech. Wherever the nature and principles of composition for crowds momentarily assembled before platforms and stages are being taught, we may expect this aspect of speech to stand untouched by arguments critical of subjects lacking distinctive content and humane values. Wherever speech is taught as a discipline which infers its primary principles and practices from the conventions, the foibles, and the psychological and physiological limitations which shape the human listener's response to ideas appareled in speech and action, there our subject is at home with the other areas of study appropriate to general education. And it is to our place in general education rather than to the expansion of our specialties that our friends, the critics, bid us attend, as we assume responsibility for the future progress of speech education.

A SIXTEENTH-CENTURY PROTEST AGAINST SPEECH

In truth, just as doctors are not applied to except for a man who is diseased and feeble, no more are orators except for a cause which is forsaken and desperate. Where no law, no equity, no right appears, there the orators pitch in with the tongue and with volubility of words,—there they shine. And as fishermen who go after eels catch nothing unless they, as it were, spread night over their nets, by roiling the water from top to bottom; so orators, if they cannot snatch away all light (as they seek to do), see to it that the point of the matter and the truth are obscured. But why do I say "obscured"? How if they even speak falsehoods? How if they speak nothing else? How if they even study to do so? For in what other way could Protagoras by speaking make the worse appear the better cause? By what other means could Carneades speak at Rome against justice, and prove supreme virtue to be the bane of states? Pericles, forsooth, when publicly humiliated and outdone by his adversary, and when the crowd before him perceived the fact, by smoothness of words persuaded those about him that he had conquered—so that the people were moved by his eloquence more than by their own eyes. Thus many rhetoricians embark upon careers as liars; nor is it any wonder; for they have Mercury as their patron and tutelary god. They glory in claiming him as the discoverer and prince of studied speech. Him! Ye gods! The deity who deceives, who lies, who first introduced the customs of robbery, of theft, of mendacity, of perjury! Who, through treachery, robbed Tiresias of his cattle, Mars of his sword, Vulcan of his tongs, Neptune of his trident, Apollo of his arrows, Venus of her girdle, and finally Jove himself of his scepter. This fellow they venerate as the father of orators, to this god they pay their vows!

John Jewel, *Oratio contra Rhetoricam*. Hoyt H. Hudson's translation. See *QJS*, XIV (1928), 382-383.

GROUP THERAPY AS A METHOD OF RETRAINING APHASICS

Aleen Agranowitz, Daniel R. Boone, Marion Ruff, Gloria G. Seacat, and Arthur L. Terr

I

THE Aphasia Clinic at the Long Beach Veterans Administration Hospital, Long Beach, California, uses both individual and group therapy in retraining aphasic patients. It will be our purpose to discuss group therapy as we have seen it function in this hospital for the past three years, where it has proved an effective supplemental method of speech rehabilitation. Group therapy and its relation to various aphasic defects will be described to emphasize the group adaptation to specific individual needs.

Language retraining for aphasics, as first used in this clinic, emphasized individual therapy. As the number of patients rapidly increased, group therapy became a necessity. As we continued to use group therapy, it became apparent that there were many desirable aspects to this type of retraining. After observing patients who had participated in both individual and group sessions, we found that an optimum language retraining program should present both individual and group therapies as complemental training techniques.

Aleen Agranowitz (B.S., Worcester State Teachers College, 1937) is Chief of the Aphasia Clinic, Veterans Administration Hospital, Long Beach, California. Daniel R. Boone, Marion Ruff, and Gloria G. Seacat are former members of Mrs. Agranowitz's staff, while Arthur L. Terr is a present member. *The authors are indebted to J. M. Nielsen, M.D., Area and National Aphasia Consultant, for his assistance in the development of this paper.*

II

Before describing our group situations and some actual training procedures, we should like to note a few of the beneficial aspects afforded by this group-type therapy:

1. Support in the form of sympathy, encouragement, humor, and understanding is given to individuals in the group by other members. As members identify themselves with one another, they project their feelings of success and failure. This empathy provides identity with the group and a greater capacity to withstand the frustrations fostered by language loss.

2. Longer exposure to learning situations is provided. It has been demonstrated that aphasics often have greater understanding when not directly addressed, so that an aphasic is much more likely to understand a response when not called on directly to perform. Another factor is the high degree of fatigability of the aphasic patient, which prohibits intensive language training for long periods of time. The natural rest periods provided in group situations mean that more therapy is possible.

3. The aphasic patient is exposed to a greater variety of methods and teaching techniques. Each therapist provides a new facet to the learning situation and a different approach. This makes possible constant repetition, which establishes new speech patterns by presenting the same unit of work in different ways in various groups.

4. Aphasic patients tend to be rigid and to avoid socializing situations. Group therapy provides a social situation based on a common need for communication and language retraining. These group friendships are the bases for small informal learning situations which continue long after clinic hours are over.

III

Our groups represent many spheres of language retraining and are divided into levels determined by the language development of the patients. This division can be illustrated by our written formulation groups, which consist of one beginning, two intermediate, and one advanced group, each level meeting a specific language loss of the individual members. The first-level writing group is concerned with learning written patterns of individual words, usually naming words. In this group, much emphasis is placed on kinesthetic methods of tracing and copying. One of the two intermediate groups has advanced to the point of memorizing words of simple spelling, of grouping words appropriately, of using individual words to fill in blanks, and of manipulating them in other ways. The other intermediate group (slightly higher in level) is ready to use words in short sentences and to begin the actual process of written formulation. The advanced group is capable of studying words from adult vocabulary lists, of writing these from dictation, of defining words, and of composing short paragraphs, as in letter writing or biographical sketches.

The patients in each group are varied in age, background, personalities, and types of language defect. Patients range in age from young traumatics of the Korean war to older World War I veterans who have also suffered brain damage. Naturally, all of these men come from many cultural, economic, and occupational backgrounds. The psychological adjustments of the men to their difficulties create many post-traumatic personality problems. Types of defects vary with the etiology of the trauma and the location and extent of the cerebral lesion.

Groups are constantly structured to meet the changing needs of the patient as determined by his defect and level of achievement. Patients are usually scheduled to attend several groups a day. At present in the clinic are the following groups, each of which will be discussed in relation to the retraining program:

Motor speech and dysarthrics (one group).
Identification, naming, and basic reading (one group).
Phonics and motor writing patterns (two groups).
Written formulation (four groups).
Reading and oral discussion (four groups).
Arithmetic (two groups).

IV

Motor aphasia results from damage to a part of the cortex described as Broca's area. Damage to this area results in the loss of memory of movements necessary for the production of speech sounds. A motor aphasic must relearn tongue and lip positions for producing these sounds. The motor speech group, which retrains aphasics in basic motor patterns, is, in many ways, the most elementary group, since participation in other oral groups is impossible until sounds and words can be produced. Dysarthrics may sometimes be trained with motor aphasia groups. However, the basic distinction between dysarthrics and aphasics must be regarded in retraining. The dysarthric's basic difficulties result from disturbed innervation of the musculature involved in speech as distinguished from the mo-

tor aphasic, who has lost the memory of movements which are necessary for the production of speech. The dysarthric knows what movements he wants to make but has difficulty making them, while the aphasic has forgotten the movements themselves.

Several methods of retraining aphasics in motor speech patterns have proved efficacious. The therapist often works with the patient in front of a mirror. In this way, the patient can observe his own tongue, teeth, and lip movements while simultaneously observing the motor patterns of the therapist. Sometimes a kinesthetic approach is necessary. Here the therapist manipulates the patient's lips as in forming an "m," where the lips may be gently pressed together. On another occasion a tongue depressor may be used to manipulate as in placement for an "l," where the tongue is raised towards the roof of the mouth. The patient with motor speech difficulties is helped by developing a good auditory discrimination for his own speech production. This is often accomplished by making recordings of the patient's speech and allowing him to listen to the replay.

In re-establishing motor speech patterns, the labial sounds are the most easily observed and imitated. The vowel sounds form another group which are often easily acquired and may constitute a primary drill. Two of the more difficult sounds are the back sounds of "k" and "g," which cannot be easily observed.

A beginning group of patients studying motor speech patterns might be observed attempting to learn the sound patterns for the sound "m." The therapist asks the patient to close his lips gently together. He points to his own lips or presses the patient's lips together, guarding against a tight pressure. One or two large mirrors are present in which the patients may observe themselves. By humming, the therapist evokes a familiar response from the patient, thus producing an "m." The "m" sound is then combined with a vowel such as "a" to produce "ma." The severe motor aphasic has just said a word! From this point, the therapist adds other sounds (such as "p" or "d"), and thus other meaningful words are said by patients, many of whom could say nothing before entering the motor group.

Groups based on the practice of motor speech patterns have proved effective. Many of the exercises are produced as a group drill. Individually, the patients have an opportunity to observe one another and improve their own production. Since a good sound production in this case is easy to determine, the group is enthusiastic when a member is successful. Conversely, there is criticism of a poor production. On higher levels, patients with residual motor defects often combine their practices with other groups such as oral reading groups.

In some cases the achievement of motor skills enables the patient to enter a reading group. However, successful motor group participation usually places the patient in the naming group.

V

Group therapy has been particularly effective in starting both sensory and motor aphasics to read and to name objects. The beginning group is usually composed of those who can name the object, those who can say a word which sounds like the name of the object, those who may give a related response, those who give a totally unrelated response, often a perseveration, and those who can give no response at all.

With such a heterogeneous grouping, the first group project is to identify and name objects. These objects are usually

arranged as a logical unit. Units are selected which fulfill the patient's immediate need of adjusting himself to his personal environment—his ward, and the speech clinic. Perhaps one naming unit may center around the personal clothing of the patients. As the group assembles in the therapy room, the therapist has a clothing box which contains the unit's clothing articles displayed on a table. The patients within the group are given the opportunity freely to handle and comment on the articles.

The therapist may then display one of the objects and ask a member of the group to name it. At this point of the therapy, specific correctness is not as significant as the actual participation in the answering session. Any response is accepted. The therapist attempts to give each group member the opportunity of initiating one of the responses. After the particular object is identified, the other group members are asked to repeat it. This is of particular value for the motor aphasics in the group. Phonetic placement may aid the patient in forming his word. If no member of the group can formulate the name of the object, the therapist usually supplies the correct one.

Whenever possible, the presentation of the actual object is followed with a picture of the same object. For example, from the clothing unit the therapist may display an actual shoe with a photograph of a shoe. The photographs of items differ in size, color, and type from the actual object. Such variety encourages the development of general concepts. Frequently, humor will come from this first naming situation. This is much desired. Patients will laugh at one another's responses and at their own inappropriate answers. The picture of a shoe might bring a seemingly unrelated response such as "bootblack." The laughter which may come from such a response is an invaluable supportive factor in the patient's beginning therapy.

The therapist then prints and writes the word shoe on the blackboard. Since the group often contains patients with varying degrees of alexia (loss of reading ability), the therapist verbalizes the word as it is written. The therapist then displays the shoe and its picture alongside the printed word. For some patients this process will be an oversimplification of the relationship between objects and the words symbolizing them; for other patients, the verbal representation may mean nothing. After each patient has made some kind of response, the therapist presents the next item from the unit. To prevent unnecessary fatigue, the therapist avoids working with the same object or word too long. In the presentation of the next object it is seldom wise to repeat the same exact training procedure. Patient interest is best maintained by varying instruction methods.

Many patients cannot successfully enter the naming group until they have had sufficient motor training to enable them to make an occasional naming response. An example of this is the case of Mr. F., a forty-one year old former furniture dealer suffering from a cerebral vascular accident and a resultant motor aphasia. Mr. F. entered the clinic using a grunt for all speech situations. At the time of his admittance, the motor speech group was temporarily disbanded; therefore, for the socializing need of the patient, Mr. F. was placed in the basic naming group. When objects were placed before him, he would obviously recognize them, but he could make no understandable response. Since the patient suffered from little auditory verbal agnosia, he followed the therapy session with great interest. It was obvious that

Mr. F. was happy with the social situations afforded him by the group. However, his verbal response in the group was a continuous failure. Finally, he was placed in a small motor group with its motor training supplemented by meetings with his therapist for short periods throughout the day. After working several months on his individual sounds and their correct phonetic placement, he was able to return to the naming group and transform his earlier eagerness into actual correct responses in the naming situations.

In aphasia retraining, new association patterns must be established. After presenting the unit objects and their word names, the naming group therapist begins to build these new associations. This is first done with the same unit words. Again we will use our word shoe. After writing the word on the blackboard, the therapist explains that he wants to write a new word to go with it. He then asks the patients for suggestions. Several related and unrelated responses may be given. The therapist then selects one, or provides one, which will be of most value to the group. For example if "bootblack" is the only response given for "shoe" the therapist might say, "Well, the bootblack certainly has a lot to do with a shoe. He shines it, doesn't he? All right then, let's take 'shine' as our new word." Shine would be a good association for shoe. The words both begin with "sh"; together they recall a familiar act; and the meaning of the two words is easily demonstrated.

After several sessions of naming objects and their associative words, the therapist may then include them in a short sentence. Extensive use of articles, connectives, and prepositions is avoided. These higher forms of language are best reserved for formulation and higher reading groups. The therapist first reads the sentence to the group, stressing the familiar words which have just been studied. Immeasurable is the confidence which the group members gain from finding sentence words which they know they can reproduce. Any new words within the sentence are read aloud by the therapist. Words too difficult for the patients at this level are not emphasized.

In this low-level naming group, the reading (or repeating) of the short sentences usually completes the unit. The therapist may then select a new unit and proceed with the presentation of the unit objects. However, an excellent practice is to intervene occasionally between units with a review naming-drill. The therapist merely presents a group of stimuli (actual objects) and their written forms to the group and asks for the members to name them. For example, a sketch of a face may be drawn on the blackboard, with emphasis on eyes, ears, nose, mouth, hair, and teeth. The therapist asks for the names of these parts and follows the responses given by writing the name near the part which that name represents. This is another way of building up object and word symbol associations.

The patient remains within the naming group until such time as he is above the general response level of the group. From this first basic naming environment he then transfers to the reading and oral formulation groups. However, it may be apparent, at this level, that the patient will benefit from specialized phonic drills, used to strengthen his written patterns and give him additional motor practice.

VI

The phonics group is composed of motor asphasics who have "graduated" from the motor speech group and patients with severe paraphasia whom we shall refer to as jargon aphasics.

The methods for retraining these two kinds of patients are identical, although their lesions are in different areas, which render dissimilar speech patterns. As the motor aphasic progresses in retraining, he may grope for his words, speaking in a slow telegraphic manner. This is not true of the jargon aphasic. The jargon aphasic uses many words, but they are frequently inappropriate and fail to express what he wants to say, thus producing his jargon. The untrained patient of this type rambles on in apparent incoherency, of which he may or may not be aware, and occasionally produces an understandable word. The phonic therapist, therefore, is confronted, on the one hand, with the building of symbols which have been destroyed, and, on the other hand, with the tearing down of nonsensical, often rhyming, patterns, and replacing them by the proper sounds. Both types of patients have one basic factor in common: each knows what he wants to say.

When the motor aphasic enters the phonics group, it is assumed that he can imitate tongue and lip positions for the letters of the alphabet, and that he knows the corresponding written letter for each sound, for this is the function of the motor speech group. Usually the jargon aphasic does not demand such an elaborate preparation. Having an active motor speech area, he is soon able to associate lip and tongue placement with the written symbol, but he generally experiences more than his share of the motor aphasic's frustration when attempting to produce a desired sound.

To illustrate group procedures in phonics at Long Beach Veterans Administration Hospital, we cite the case of Mr. B., a former metallurgist, who suffered a cerebral vascular accident with resultant jargon aphasia. This thirty-five year old man was admitted to the Aphasia Clinic two months after his accident and immediately joined the phonics group, which was working on a list of one-syllable words rhyming with the phonetic "ai": "by, sigh, die, guy, rye," etc.; that is, words having the same vowel sound but a different spelling. Most of the others (chiefly the motor aphasics), having the sound firmly fixed in mind, could ignore the discrepancy between sight and sound, but not this new member of the class, who read the first three words as, "ilke, bawkle, sackly," and, realizing his errors, became very confused and embarrassed.

During the following week every avenue of approach was employed to enable him to achieve success with merely one sound, "ai." The patient would close his eyes and listen to the sound repeated time and again; he would view the letter or symbol as it was spoken; he would listen to recordings of his attempts (along with the rest of the group) to repeat or initiate the sound. Several successful members of the group would try to help him while others were drilling. Finally, a list of one-syllable words containing the diphthong "ai" was read to him quickly, and he was encouraged to repeat each one just as quickly without stopping to think how to form the word. Occasionally, in a hit-and-miss fashion, he would say one of these words correctly, "pie." When this occurred, it was noted that he was able to repeat "pie" many times immediately afterwards without losing the vowel sound. "Pie" was then written for him, he was shown a picture of it, he learned to write it, it was recorded, and eventually he could say this word consistently whenever he desired. The confidence he gained from this one success was enough to enable him to overcome a

large part of his initial shyness in attempting to produce sounds and words. By using "pie" as a sort of springboard, he was then able to pronounce such words as "die, tie, lie," words having the same vowel sound and spelling except for the initial letter. As the vowel sound became fixed, the list of words that he had been confronted with and had failed on his first day was presented to him again. This time, much to the delight of everyone present, he read them more clearly and rapidly than any member of the group. But his troubles were not over, for each vowel sound had to be learned by the same method until he could switch from "be" to "by, bay, bow, baa, boo," and from "boo" to "see, die, low, hay," and so on through the alphabet, interchanging medial vowel and initial consonant sounds. Gradually, final consonant sounds were emphasized in the group, and this proved to be the most difficult phase of phonic retraining to date for Mr. B. and several others. To enable the patients to concentrate on the final sound, the therapist started with words that had the same initial consonant and medial vowel sounds but different endings. Thus, words like "fade, fake, fare, fame, fate," were used. From these the class worked into initial and final consonant changes with varied vowel sounds.

At present, Mr. B. is working at the top level of the group. He is able to read short sentences containing monosyllabic words with varied sounds. Occasionally, he finds it necessary to refer to the rhyming vowel lists he keeps in his notebook, as do other members of the class. Daily, he demands less assistance; as he listens to others and notes their improvement, and as he listens to recent recordings played in contrast to earlier recordings, he slowly regains the needed confidence in himself. Besides attending his phonic class and learning phonic patterns, Mr. B. continues in his writing class. Written formulation puts into practical use much of what he has learned in his study of phonics.

VII

Written formulation represents the most complicated language function and one of the more difficult aspects of retraining. Defective formulation manifests itself when other types of aphasia, such as an anomia or a motor loss, are present. Formulation of language is dependent on subsidiary functioning such as auditory recognition of a word, motor pattern for reproducing it, and correct association with other words.

The therapist who trains groups in formulation, either oral or written, must be aware of all phases of retraining, in order to recognize the significance of the language losses he will find in his group. Actually, formulation practice begins very early in group work. The therapist who works with patients with anomia is usually teaching some formulation. For example, after the word shoe is taught and the associated word shine, the therapist may write on the board "The boy shines the shoes." He will read this statement to his patients. Even if they cannot produce a complete sentence, the association is made. The teacher of motor speech patterns often presents a pattern of related words such as "I am fine" or "I want to go to the show." Using complete sentences with motor aphasics not only produces a feeling of accomplishment for the patient, but also provides a good phonic drill. At this level the connectives, expletives, articles, and pronouns are not emphasized, but they are included in oral and written drills.

As the patients advance into intermediate levels, the problem of formulation becomes more pronounced. Patients are

more aware of the linking and completing words, are more concerned when they cannot recognize "the" and "they" in reading, are disturbed when they forget the proper usage of "is" and "are," and are confused with their misuse of pronouns in oral speech. In the intermediate oral groups, the patients often use completing exercises, such as "I went ....." The therapist presents the elements of a complete sentence and aids the patients in arranging the words correctly or in adding needed ones. Action pictures are present for description. Useful questions and phrases, such as "I am going to the show," or "I want two packs of cigarettes," are practiced. The therapist, in written formulation, attempts to do much the same type of practice with written symbols. Here the arrangements of prepositions, articles, and other units of sentence order, are even more difficult to teach. Prepositions and verbs are often taught by showing the relationships of one object to another or one word to another. The word "in" has been demonstrated by showing the group a spoon inside a cup. It is assumed that these people already know how to spell these words. However, if the spelling of the word representing the object cannot be recalled, the patients are directed to draw a picture of the object. Sentences such as the following one are used to explain the meaning of a preposition and its relation to the rest of the sentence: "The spoon is placed in the cup." The patients write the word "in." To make the concept of the word "in" still clearer in the minds of the patients, the word "on" is often taught for purpose of contrast. The patients, at first, distinguish between the actions and relationships they see by writing and saying "in" or "on," as the case may be. At another level, they construct sentences using the prepositions and verbs studied. It is usually necessary to present many examples of demonstration-type to clarify the prepositions.

The advanced groups in oral and written formulation are clinically among the most interesting. The patients have now advanced to the point of being able to formulate many ideas and can actually ventilate their feelings. The therapist stimulates the group with a wide variety of techniques, introduces timely topics, and presents stimulating articles from newspapers, magazines, and film strips. Often these groups are allowed to proceed as the patients themselves indicate.

The written-formulation work in advanced groups may expand along lines of interest to the individual patients. One patient writes of his hobby, another makes notes for an autobiography he wants to write, and another gains facility in personal letter writing.

Written formulation is used in this clinic as an excellent method of strengthening the patient's oral speech patterns. In addition to his writing group, he attends one of the reading or oral-formulation groups.

VIII

In the Aphasia Clinic, the naming group, previously discussed, has been set up to meet the needs of those patients who have suffered the most complete loss. As the patient achieves some success in word recognition in the phonic and naming groups, he moves into the lowest-level reading group.

The reading groups are composed of patients suffering from varying degrees of alexia. A patient may suffer from one or a combination of such specific difficulties as the failure to recognize letters, figures, syllables, words, or statements. Four separate groups in the clinic are structured to meet the needs

of the patients whose reading levels range from the almost completely alexic, to the most advanced.

Here, as in all clinic groups, a feeling of success by the patient is of primary importance, and is the greatest single factor in giving him the much-needed feeling of confidence in his own ability. This feeling is achieved through the encouragement and approbation of the other patients as well as of the therapist. The patients get a strong group feeling, and are highly pleased when they hear such exclamations as "Good," "Fine," "Smart," coming from some other member of the class.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty encountered in the lowest level of reading is that of finding suitable reading material. Simple words and sentences may easily be found in the elementary reading books for children, but the subject matter is of such a nature that its very simplicity gives the adult person a feeling of inadequacy. In this particular situation, one is dealing with adults, many of whom have been highly successful people prior to their illness, and whose intelligence may have been only slightly impaired. For such a person as this, it is highly discouraging to read the simple sentences found in children's books such as, "Mary and Jack have a little cat named Buffy."

The therapist uses ingenuity in presenting material that is simple and elementary, yet challenging and adult in content. He prepares original sentences and short paragraphs within the reading abilities of the patients. The therapist includes words that will stress some particular sound, or sounds, with which the patients are having difficulty. The sentences are short and simply stated, but the subject matter is adult and purposeful, such as, "I like coffee," "I am going home," or "I want a pass."

After the sentence is placed upon the board, each individual patient in the group is asked to pronounce the difficult words. The sentence is then read in unison, the men gaining support from one another. The therapist is not too hasty in giving assistance, but recognizes the frustration tolerance of each group member. There is no feeling of the pressure of time, and the attitude of the therapist is highly permissive.

When a sentence is fairly well mastered, but not necessarily perfected by the group, another and yet another sentence are added to make a complete paragraph. Very often, material in a humorous vein stimulates the imagination of the patients, and creates a feeling of pleasure in the class.

Reading comprehension is tested on all three levels. In this lowest-level group a written command was handed to each member of the group (e.g., "Open the door," "Close the window," "Put the ash tray on the desk"), with instructions to read it silently, then carry out the command. It was discovered that one patient who had been reading words fairly fluently had no understanding of the meaning of a sentence. Here was an example of a patient with alexia, who was able to read words aloud, but failed to understand what he read! This information was passed on to the therapist doing individual work with the patient, and the patient received special attention for his difficulty.

As the patient continues to improve, he advances into the intermediate group, where many of the same techniques are used, but the material is more difficult. Longer words are given, and the sentences are more complex. Entire paragraphs are placed on the blackboard, or several paragraphs in some text may be assigned.

Here, again, reading comprehension

is checked. Oral questions are asked, simple true-false tests are given, and discussions of the meaning of words and passages are encouraged.

A variety of materials is used in this intermediate group: grade-level books in history and geography; newspaper headlines and stories; short anecdotes from magazines; and popular poems.

One patient in this group, a young traumatic patient from World War II, became so interested in an article concerning Ralph Bunche that he used his own initiative in writing a radio commentator asking for more information. The entire group became interested in this project. When a short excerpt from the Preamble to the United Nations Charter was placed upon the blackboard, the reading group felt challenged to read the difficult words and to discuss the meaning.

The most advanced reading group is structured to encourage more independence in the patient. He is asked to read full-length articles in magazines and newspapers and discuss what he has read. To check reading comprehension further, the entire group is asked to read one specific article, usually during the class period, and this is used as a topic for general discussion. Debates may be conducted, in an informal manner, and the patients are encouraged to give specific and definite arguments, thus forcing them to use concrete and logical reasoning. Heated discussions often result from the introduction of timely, controversial news items.

The therapist has the problem of seeing that each patient has an equal opportunity to express himself, as a few individual members may have a tendency to dominate the discussion.

It is not uncommon for this advanced group to get away entirely from any set procedure, and to select a subject of their own; often it may be a personal problem, and the therapist encourages and listens objectively to any expressions of discouragement or hostility. In fact, out of this discussion atmosphere have come two psychotherapy groups, which allow the men to ventilate their feelings under the indirect guidance of the therapist.

Speech training is an integral part of all the reading groups; the trained speech therapist is able to ascertain the individual needs of each member of the group, and uses drills for specific sounds. In one group, it was noted that the patients were having particular difficulty with endings of words, completely omitting them in many instances. A part of each class period was used on drill words stressing such sounds as "s" or "d."

Each patient in the clinic is not necessarily placed in all of these three successive groups, but may be placed into any of them directly, as the results of previous diagnostic tests may determine. The length of time spent in any one particular group depends upon individual performance, and may not be ascertained by any set procedure or schedule. Levels of achievement are directly proportionate to the capabilities of the patient, both physical and emotional.

IX

Arithmetic impairments are many and varied in form. Patients may have trouble recognizing numbers and relating the values of them. Some in the group are not able to indicate that "1" is different from "2," or that a "1" is the same as "1" when asked to select and compare figures. Some patients fail to understand the meanings of mathematical signs. A plus sign no longer tells the patient to add. A minus sign does not cause him to subtract. The ability to count objects may be lost. When the patient is directed

to indicate the number of like coins in his hand, he becomes puzzled. The patient may not be able to comprehend the value of coins and finds it difficult to indicate that two nickels are equivalent to one dime.

Many individuals are unable to relate and understand the mathematics involved in the measurement of time and space. If the therapist were to ask the time, the patient may look at the clock, but give no indication that the hands of the clock tell him that it is 12:30. He fails to know the significance of the hour hand, the minute hand, and the second hand. Several patients fail to comprehend the difference between big and small, wide and long. Or perhaps the graduations on a yardstick are just markings without meaning.

A large number of aphasics suffer from acalculia (a disturbance of recognition of numbers and a subsequent difficulty in using these numbers for calculation). The number of figures a person can add may be limited. To add three figures might leave a patient breathless with frustration. Sometimes, if the same figures are placed horizontally, such as "2 plus 3 plus 4," he sighs with relief because he can solve it when presented this way, while if they are placed vertically he cannot do a thing. The concepts of carrying and borrowing numbers in addition and subtraction may render patients helpless.

The idea that a fraction is a part of a number may cause dismay to the individual having acalculia. The mechanics in calculating are disturbed. The relationships of number to number and process to process may be so disrupted as to affect the process of calculating. A former mathematics professor, who was able to recognize errors made in arithmetic by every patient in the program, including the therapist, would turn red and pound his fist with rage when he continually failed to divide numbers presented in fraction form. Another man, a former engineer, was able to work through algebra only if he reduced most of his calculations to addition and subtraction. Material to be multiplied was broken down to its addition components; yet he was able to divide in a normal manner without any difficulty. Many impaired individuals are able successfully to solve a problem if only a single process is involved, but if two processes are necessary to obtain an answer, then nothing is attempted.

Group therapy is based upon the choice of topics that are familiar to all the patients. These topics are such that they may find application to the hospital setting. Purchasing an article or measuring a box or telling time is easily applied in out-of-clinic situations. Accompanying the general topic chosen, the concepts of numbers and processes are emphasized. More specific topics, such as the arithmetic involved in electricity, or the arithmetic involved in tool designing or in drafting, are determined by the patient's former interests and background. Utilizing both topics of general and of specific interest often helps in speeding up the retraining process. It seems as if the choice of what is familiar and what is of major interest to patients helps maximize recall and relearning. Patients are constantly encouraged to try out what they have regained, in the hospital canteen or in the hospital shop. Often other departments such as Manual Arts Therapy and Occupational Therapy co-operate in utilizing planned arithmetic projects.

A group of patients having as their major difficulty the recognition of numbers learned how to count, recognize numbers, and indicate the value of coins in the following manner. The therapist

gathered a number of articles together, such as pieces of soap, toothbrushes, and towels. On each article was placed a price tag similar to that used in the canteen. As many numbers as possible were typed on the tags. Each article was labeled with its most common name. If the article was a bar of soap, then "soap" was inscribed on it. Then various denominations of coins were distributed among the patients. The patients were directed by the therapist's pantomime to copy the number on the price tag and simultaneously attempt to vocalize it. One patient proceeded to count the number of like articles. He initiated the group into counting "1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ... soap." Several patients initiated the counting of coins. "1, 2, 3, 4, 5, ... pennies." The group proceeded to match the number of coins with the number on the price tags. If one price tag indicated 5c, then the patient laid five pennies beside the article. Others in the same group gave each other change and checked one another's results. If one patient gave another a dime, then the recipient gave back two nickels or ten pennies, and both patients said "ten." Others did much the same thing, but instead of saying aloud what they saw, they wrote "five" or "5" or "$.05." As the group progressed, they were able to copy the numbers on the price tag and add them up. They then worked out subtraction by taking away a number of the articles or coins. These same patients, with and without speech, were then able to go to the canteen, point out an article, compare the canteen price tag with the coins in their hands, and make a fair exchange.

As the patients progress in their ability to read and write and understand spoken words, it is necessary to explain the differences in the meanings of words and what they mean in arithmetic. A group of patients may be presented with simple problems such as, "What is the discount on . . . . ?" The word "discount" has to be explained. The instructor is in the habit of asking the members of the group what they think the word means, or how it is used in addition and in subtraction. They sometimes show what it means by recalling an experience they themselves have had in the past, or by citing the arithmetical process involved in making a discount. The therapist stands by and fills in necessary information when the concerted group explanation falls wide at vital spots. The word "equal" was explained by bringing into play actual scales. The patients supplied the spelling, concrete examples, and incidents of equality. They underlined the word whenever they came across it or its equivalent.

Banking has been a beneficial method in teaching patients to transpose figures into words and sentences. Patients are given blank checks. They fill them in with figures and also with the amounts in written form. The checks are distributed among the patients, and they read what they see. Another beneficial topic has been the construction of shopping lists. Patients learn the abbreviations for dozen, inches, and quarts.

To supplement and to strengthen what has been relearned in the group, the patients are given many pure arithmetic problem drills. If they have come across addition in their group activity, then they are given a number of sums to work out. Many of the specific difficulties such as borrowing and carrying are lessened as this procedure is repeated over and over.

When a patient's arithmetic has gone beyond the general achievement level of his group, he may be referred to Educational Therapy for additional training.

At this point, however, arithmetic is no longer a retraining problem, although training may remain necessary in other language spheres.

X

These, then, are the group situations in the clinic; and these, too, are the specific therapeutic methods used in these situations. From an administrative point of view, group therapy provides a means of treating a larger number of patients for speech defects than would be possible on an individual basis alone. From the standpoint of the clinic, this type of retraining appears to have excellent therapeutic value as an adjunct to individual therapy. It is a palatable form of therapy for the patients themselves, who like it well enough to form their own groups and continue retraining processes without a therapist present. While our observations at this time must be subjective and based only on clinical observations, we conclude that group therapy is an important factor in the total retraining of aphasics.

SPEECH PROBLEMS IN THE RENAISSANCE

They that haue no good voyces by nature, or cannot well vtter their wordes, must seeke for helpe els where. Exercise of the bodie, fasting, moderation in meate and drinke, gaping wide, or singing plaine Song, and counterfeyting those that doe speake distinctly, helpe much to haue a good deliueraunce. *Demosthenes* beeing not able to pronounce the first letter of that Arte which he professed, but would say, for, *Rhetorike, Letolike,* vsed to put little stones vnder his tongue, and so pronounced, whereby he speake at length so plainly, as any man in the world could doe. Musicians in England haue vsed to put gagges in childrens mouthes, that they might pronounce distinctly, but now with the losse and lacke of Musick, the loue also is gone of bringing vp children to speake plainly. Some there bee that either naturally, or through folly haue such euill voyces, and such lacke of vtteraunce, and such euill iesture, that it much defaceth all their doinges. One pipes out his wordes so small, through default of his winde pipe, that ye would thinke he whistled. An other is hource in his throte, that a man would thinke, he came lately from scouring of Harnesse. An other speakes, as though he had Plummes in his mouth. An other speakes in his throte, as though a good Ale crumme stucke fast. An other rattles his wordes. An other choppes his wordes. An other speakes, as though his wordes had neede to bee heaued out with leauers. An other speakes, as though his words should bee weighed in a Ballaunce. An other gapes to fetch winde at euery third worde. This man barkes out his English Northren-like, with I say, and thou lad. And other speakes so finely, as though he were brought vp in a Ladies Chamber. As I knewe a Priest that was as nice as a Nunnes Henne, when hee would say Masse, he would neuer say *Dominus vobiscum,* but *Dominus vobicum.*

Thomas Wilson, *The Arte of Rhetorique,* ed. G. H. Mair (Oxford, 1909), p. 219.

EFFECTS OF ORDER AND AUTHORITY IN AN ARGUMENTATIVE SPEECH

Howard Gilkinson, Stanley F. Paulson, and Donald E. Sikkink

I

DURING the past two years we have participated along with colleagues in the Department of Psychology in a program of research concerned in general with verbal behavior. As our work progressed, the present writers came to think of research in that area as falling into three categories. In the first of these we placed those investigations concerned with verbal behavior as it relates to the general laws of human behavior. Certain studies of word conditioning and word association might be taken as examples of this type of research. As a rule this type deals with words rather than with connected discourse, and while it may prove important in relation to language communication, the immediate interest of the investigator usually lies elsewhere. Obviously, such studies are more likely to be carried out by psychologists than by teachers of speech.

In the second category, the investigator is concerned directly with immediate problems of language communication. He is confronted by a specific task: the conveyance of a particular message or body of information, or the winning of acceptance for a certain attitude. The investigator combines his knowledge of language and his experimental skill to solve this problem. His work may prove to be important as a basis for future theoretical formulations, but his immediate interest is the conveyance of a particular idea to a particular group of persons under a particular set of circumstances. Much of the investigation of language in the armed services during World War II falls into this classification.

Research in the third category also concerns itself with communication, but interest centers in more general questions than those dealt with in the second category. The experimenter may ask such questions as: Is it better to present one side or both sides of a controversial issue? What is the role of ethos? Is a well-organized speech superior to a poorly organized speech? Is climax order superior to anti-climax order? What is the contribution of good delivery? How do various forms of emphasis affect an audience? How does the attitude of the listener affect his reception of controversial statements? Some investigators interested in this class of research regard the literature of rhetoric as the main source of inspiration of such questions. They seek not only to confirm a generalization but to attach suitable qualifications to it. For example, they wish not only to know that ethos is a factor in persuasion (which no one probably seriously doubts) but also to discover under what conditions its effect is maximal, or minimal, or nonexistent.

Howard Gilkinson (Ph.D., Minnesota, 1935) is Professor of Speech at the University of Minnesota. Stanley F. Paulson (Ph.D., Minnesota, 1953) is Assistant Professor of General Studies at the University of Minnesota. Donald E. Sikkink (M.A., Minnesota, 1951) is a Ford Foundation Teaching Intern at the same institution. *This article describes part of a larger program of investigation carried out at the University of Minnesota under the sponsorship of the Office of Naval Research (Contract No. N8 onr 66216).*

The investigations carried out by us fall in the third category. Each study or series of studies, with one exception, represented a follow-up of a previous investigation. Edwards had found that listeners assimilated statements which conformed to their bias better than statements which ran contrary to it.[1] The present writers ran a series of experiments to confirm Edwards' general conclusions and to discover if biased listening is affected by certain types of presentation.[2]

Another study dealt with ethos, following Haiman's method,[3] and sought to relate the outcomes to certain audience variables, i.e., sex and attitude. Still another inquiry began with Hovland's[4] study of a one-sided as opposed to a two-sided presentation of a controversial issue.[5]

The results of two other studies are reported in this present article. Before presenting these results, let us review the purpose of the research program as a whole. We have stated or implied three objects: (1) to discover if some outcome found in a previous study emerges when the investigation is repeated; (2) to broaden the sampling basis of the original study, particularly with reference to the number of speech topics employed; (3) to find out under what specific conditions a given rhetorical factor operates. Probably the only one of these three which raises any question in the mind of the reader is the first. He may feel that one study is sufficient proof of the operation of a given factor or condition, if the result is statistically significant. The present writers feel that two observations should be made in this connection. First, "statistically significant outcomes," as they are called, are bound to occur occasionally as a matter of chance, i.e., are due to variations in random sampling. Secondly and perhaps more significantly, owing to the complexities of experimentation with connected discourse, a positive outcome might be due to the operation of some unrecognized condition. Follow-up studies incorporating what are thought to be *essential features*, without attempting to duplicate non-essential matters, should provide a check on that possibility.

II

The following study deals with the relative effectiveness of authority and non-authority presentation on audience attitude shift, retention, and convincingness ratings. Authority presentation (as used in this study) refers to the use of statements made by persons of prestige or expertness to support arguments used in a speech. The use of such quotations is based on the assumption that audiences will be more likely to believe, retain, and admire a speech if the speaker demonstrates that experts and persons of prestige agree with his arguments.

A twenty-minute speech was prepared favoring the proposition, "The North Atlantic Treaty Nations should form a Federal Union." It contained three main contentions: (1) Soviet Russia is a threat to world peace; (2) present organizations cannot meet that threat; (3) a Federal Union would be able to meet that threat. The argumentative

[1] A. L. Edwards, "Political Frames of Reference as a Factor Influencing Recognition," *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.*, XXXVI (1941), 34-50.

[2] H. Gilkinson, S. F. Paulson, and D. Sikkink, "Conditions Affecting the Communication of Controversial Statements in Connected Discourse: Forms of Presentation and the Political Frame of Reference of the Listener," *SM*, XX (1953), 253-260.

[3] F. S. Haiman, "An Experimental Study of the Effects of Ethos in Public Speaking," *SM*, XVI (1949), 190-202.

[4] C. I. Hovland, A. A. Lumsdaine, and F. D. Sheffield, *Experiments on Mass Communication* (Princeton, 1949), 201.

[5] S. F. Paulson, "The Effects of Prestige of the Speaker and Acknowledgment of Opposing Arguments on Audience Retention and Shift of Attitude." (Unpublished.)

development of these contentions included quotations from six authorities, as described in Table I. These quotations made up twenty per cent of the material included in the speech.

TABLE I
AUTHORITIES USED, INTRODUCTORY REMARKS, AND THE ARGUMENT SUPPORTED BY THE QUOTATION

Authority	Identifications	Argument Supported
Owen Roberts	"Former Justice of the Supreme Court"	No. 2
Estes Kefauver	"Senator"	No. 2
Guy M. Gillette	"Senator"	No. 2
Beardsly Ruml	"Financial Expert"	No. 3
Percival Brundage	"Director of the Natl. Bureau of Economic Research"	No. 3
John Foster Dulles	"Secretary of State"	Main proposition

An adult male who was not known by the experimental subjects recorded the speech. Two identical and simultaneous tape recordings were made. This recording was accomplished by leading the microphone signal to the amplifier and through a wall circuit into an adjoining room. From this circuit, a divided connection led the signal to two similar tape recorders so that simultaneous recording could be done. After recording, one tape was cut and spliced to remove the names of the authorities and the introductory remarks which served to identify them. Care had been taken in writing the transitions of the speech, so that after the names and identifying remarks had been removed, the quoted material remained an integral part of the speech. The *speech with the names removed* became the non-authority speech. The speech in which names and identifying remarks remained, and where the quoted material was identified as being the words of the authority, was called the authority speech.

The subjects used in this study were students enrolled in the Fundamentals of Speech sequence at the University of Minnesota during the spring quarter of 1953. One week prior to hearing the speeches they filled out a "Preliminary Questionnaire for a Listening Project." They were asked to give their name, age, sex, college grade average, political affiliation; and to indicate their attitude on the proposition, "The member nations that belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (Belgium, Great Britain, France, Netherlands, Luxemburg, Iceland, United States, Portugal, Canada, Greece, Turkey, Norway, Denmark, Italy) should form a Federal Union." A definition of "Federal Union" was read to the subjects to insure uniformity of response to that term. Attitude was indicated by a numerical rating using the following values: Strongly agree (5), Agree (4), Neutral (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1).

The subjects heard the speech in groups ranging from twenty-five to one hundred. They were told that they were to take part in a listening project, that they should not take notes, that scores on the exercise would not affect their course grade, and that their listening scores would be returned to them the following week. The speech was then played.

The tape recorder used for playback was located in the front of the auditorium. Uniform settings for tone and volume were maintained throughout the playback. After hearing the speech, the subjects filled out a sixty-item true-false test based on the material in the speech; and again they indicated their attitude

on the proposition, using the five-point rating scale. In addition, the subjects rated the speech for "convincingness" on a nine-point scale.

Subjects who heard the authority speech were paired on initial attitude and college grade average with those who heard the non-authority speech. There were the same number of men and women in the two groups. Average age, and the number of persons of each political affiliation, were computed for the two audiences. Results, given in Table II below, indicate the similarity of the two groups on a number of characteristics.

Table III gives the results of the pre-test to post-test attitude shift for the two experimental groups and the control group which heard no speech.

Table IV gives the comparative effectiveness of the two forms of presentation on attitude shift, retention, and convincingness.

As for our conclusions and interpretations, we should like to make the following points:

1. Both authority and non-authority presentation effected a significant shift of attitude in the audience which heard them.
2. The control group did not make a significant shift in attitude.
3. The results of this study did not reveal any significant differences between authority and non-authority presentation on attitude shift, retention, or convincingness ratings.
4. Although not statistically significant, all differences favored authority presentation.

III

In 1946, Sponberg reported a study in which a twenty-minute speech, containing three arguments, was presented orally by means of recording to two matched audiences in climax order (least impor-

TABLE II
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO AUDIENCES

Variable	Non-Authority Audience	Authority Audience
Initial Attitude	Paired	Paired
College Grade Average	Paired	Paired
Men	88	88
Women	42	42
Average age	20.98	19.86
Political Affiliation		
Republicans	55	64
Democrats	48	42
Independents	25	22
Other	2	2

TABLE III
ATTITUDE SHIFT

	N	Mean on Pre-test	Mean on Post-test	Difference	t
Control Group (no speech)	38	2.76	2.71	—.05	.43
Total Group (authority)	130	2.80	3.25	.45	4.78**
Total Group (non-authority)	130	2.80	3.20	.40	4.91**
Men (authority)	88	2.76	3.16	.40	3.45**
Men (non-authority)	88	2.76	3.12	.36	3.60**
Women (authority)	42	2.88	3.43	.55	3.81**
Women (non-authority)	42	2.88	3.38	.50	3.65**

**Significant at the 1% level.

TABLE IV
COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE TWO FORMS OF PRESENTATION

	N	Mean	Difference	t
ATTITUDE SHIFT				
Total Group (authority)	130	.45	.05	.43
Total Group (non-authority)	130	.40		
Men (authority)	88	.40	.04	.19
Men (non-authority)	88	.36		
Women (authority)	42	.55	.05	.29
Women (non-authority)	42	.50		
RETENTION				
Total Group (authority)	130	41.63	.30	.60
Total Group (non-authority)	130	41.33		
Men (authority)	88	31.93	.04	.17
Men (non-authority)	88	31.89		
Women (authority)	42	40.97	.78	1.00
Women (non-authority)	42	40.19		
CONVINCINGNESS				
Total Group (authority)	130	5.10	.34	1.60
Total Group (non-authority)	130	4.76		
Men (authority)	88	4.81	.26	.91
Men (non-authority)	88	4.55		
Women (authority)	42	5.71	.50	1.62
Women (non-authority)	42	5.21		

tant argument first) and in anti-climax order (most important argument first).[6] The investigator found a clear-cut advantage for anti-climax order in respect to retention and also in respect to the shift of attitude caused by the most important argument.

We will here describe the outcome of two experiments incorporating the same general features employed by Sponberg. Our objective was to test the consistency of his results, and to broaden the sample of speech topics.

The first experiment, carried out during the winter of 1953, made use of two speeches. One speech, on "Defer marriage until your military service is completed," corresponded closely to the subject material used by Sponberg, while the second speech dealt with the proposition, "The 18-year-old should be allowed to vote."

Five supporting arguments for each proposition were presented to forty-four students, similar in background to the experimental group, who were told to give a rank of 1 to the argument they considered most important, 2 to the argument they considered next most important, etc., until they had ranked each of the five supporting arguments. Results are given in Table V.

Sub-group analysis on the basis of sex and attitude toward the proposition did not reveal any significant deviations from the average rankings given in Table V. Three arguments differing distinctively in average rank were then selected for each proposition. The arguments and their rank are shown in Table VI.

The speeches were then prepared, and factual material, statistical evidence, analogy, and authority were used to support each of the arguments. The amount of space given to each argument was directly proportional to its rank value. Table VII shows this proportion in terms of time indications.

[6] Harold Sponberg, "The Relative Effectiveness of Climax and Anti-Climax Order in an Argumentative Speech," *SM*, XIII, No. 1 (1946), 35-44.

TABLE V
RANK VALUE OF SUPPORTING ARGUMENTS

PROPOSITION: A young man subject to military service should defer marriage until that service is completed.	
Supporting Arguments:	*Average Rank*
1. because marriage would prevent him from becoming an effective soldier.	4.58
2. because of the danger that he will become a crippled dependent.	3.23
3. because he will be financially unable to support a wife.	2.90
4. because the period of separation may become unpredictably long.	2.14
5. because such a marriage might be hasty and ill-advised.	2.14
PROPOSITION: The voting age should be lowered to 18.	
Supporting Arguments:	
1. because the eighteen-year-old of today is better informed than in previous generations.	1.89
2. because the government assumes the eighteen-year-old can bear other adult responsibilities at that age.	1.68
3. because our government lags far behind other countries in lowering the voting age requirement.	4.80
4. because young people make more use of their voting privilege than do their elders in society.	3.18
5. because such a reduction in the age-limit has worked successfully when it has been tried.	3.45

TABLE VI
SUPPORTING ARGUMENTS INCLUDED IN THE SPEECHES

Argument	Average Rank
1. because such a marriage might be hasty and ill-advised.	2.14
2. because of the danger that he will become a crippled dependent.	3.23
3. because marriage would prevent him from becoming an effective soldier.	4.58
1. because the government assumes the eighteen-year-old can bear other adult responsibilities at that age.	1.68
2. because young people make more use of their voting privilege than do their elders in society.	3.18
3. because our government lags far behind other countries in lowering the voting age requirement.	4.80

TABLE VII
TIME ALLOTTED TO EACH ARGUMENT

Argument	Speech on Marriage	Speech on Vote
Introduction	1 minute, 50 seconds	1 minute, 50 seconds
Large Argument	7 minutes	6 minutes, 30 seconds
Medium Argument	4 minutes	4 minutes
Small Argument	2 minutes, 30 seconds	2 minutes, 30 seconds

A skilled speaker read each speech while two identical and simultaneous tape recordings were made of them. One tape from each pair was then cut and spliced so that the arguments were arranged in anti-climax order. Care had been taken in writing the transitions so that such rearrangement could be accomplished without changing the meaning of the speech. The order was that of large argument, medium argument, and small argument for the anti-climax form of presentation, while the climax order was that of small argument, medium argument, and large argument.

Subjects used in this experiment were students enrolled in the Fundamentals of Speech sequence at the University of Minnesota (Minneapolis Campus) during the winter quarter of 1953. One week prior to the testing day, all subjects were asked to fill out "A Prelim-

inary Questionnaire for a Listening Project." Each subject gave his name, age, sex, college grade average, college classification; and he indicated his attitude on the two following propositions:

A young man subject to military service should defer marriage until that service is completed.

The voting age should be lowered to eighteen.

Attitude was indicated numerically according to the following scale:

Strongly agree	5
Agree	4
Neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly disagree	1

Subjects who heard climax-order were paired with subjects who heard anti-climax order on initial attitude and college grade average. In addition, the average age and average year in college of each audience were computed. Table VIII reveals the similarity of the two audiences in respect to controlled characteristics.

The subjects heard the speeches in groups ranging in size from twenty-five to one hundred. No subject heard more than one speech. Subjects were told they were taking part in a listening project, that they were not to take notes, that their listening scores would not affect their grades, and that listening scores would be returned to them during the following week. After hearing the speech, the subjects filled out a sixty-item true-false test based on the material in the speech: they indicated their attitude on the two propositions using the five-point numerical scale; and they rated the speech for convincingness on a nine-point scale.

The second experiment was completed during the spring of 1953 and followed essentially the same design employed in the one just described, except that only the one speech on voting was used. The pre-attitude testing and preliminary questionnaire were filled out just before the subjects heard the speech, and the post-tests were given immediately after they heard the speech.

Subjects used were students enrolled in the Communications 1-2-3 sequence at the University of Minnesota (St. Paul Campus). Thirty-nine subjects, paired on initial attitude and college grade average, made up each audience; in addition, the average age and average year in college of each audience were computed, as is indicated in Table IX.

TABLE VIII

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO AUDIENCES IN EXPERIMENT NO. 1

Variable	Audience Hearing Anti-Climax Order		Audience Hearing Climax Order
College Grade Average		Paired	
Initial Attitude		Paired	
Number of Women	29		29
Number of Men	38		38
Average Age	20.46		20.16
Average Year in College	2.01		1.93

TABLE IX

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWO AUDIENCES IN EXPERIMENT NO. 2

Variable	Audience Hearing Anti-Climax Order		Audience Hearing Climax Order
College Grade Average		Paired	
Initial Attitude		Paired	
Number of Women	18		18
Number of Men	21		21
Average Age	19.03		19.46
Average Year in College	1.08		1.03

After hearing the speech, subjects were asked to complete the sixty-item true-false test, to indicate their attitude on the vote proposition again, and to rate the speech for convincingness. No control group was used in this experiment because both the pre- and post-attitude testing were completed during the same hour.

Table X gives the results of the pre- to post-attitude shift. In each study, both forms of presentation resulted in a significant shift of attitude. The control group in the first experiment did not shift significantly.

Table XI gives the results for the comparative effectiveness of the two forms of presentation on main proposition, large argument, medium argument, and small argument attitude shift. The only significant difference occurs in the second experiment in favor of climax presentation in attitude shift on the main proposition.

Table XII gives the results for the comparative effectiveness of the two forms of presentation in respect to retention. The only significant difference appears in Experiment No. 1 where the anti-climax order showed better retention of the small argument.

TABLE X
ATTITUDE SHIFT ON THE MAIN PROPOSITION

Audience	N	Mean Attitude Pre-Test	Mean Attitude Post-Test	Difference	t
Anti-Climax (Experiment #1)	67	3.33	3.58	.25	2.43**
Climax (Experiment #1)	67	3.33	3.63	.30	2.52**
Control Group (Experiment #1)	134	3.04	2.94	.10	1.54
Anti-Climax (Experiment #2)	39	3.74	3.97	.23	2.47**
Climax (Experiment #2)	39	3.74	4.26	.52	4.77**

**Significant at the 1% level.

TABLE XI
COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLIMAX AND ANTI-CLIMAX ORDER ON ATTITUDE SHIFT

Audience		N	Mean Attitude Shift	Difference	t
		Main Proposition			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.25	.05	.31
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.30		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.23	.29	2.19*
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.52		
		Large Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.48	.11	.53
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.37		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.26	.10	.72
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.36		
		Medium Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.63	.17	.90
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.46		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.61	.11	.66
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	.72		
		Small Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.91	.00	.00
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	.91		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	1.18	.00	.00
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	1.18		

*Significant at the 5% level.

TABLE XII

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLIMAX AND ANTI-CLIMAX ORDER ON RETENTION

Audience		N	Mean Retention Score	Difference	t
		Total Retention			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	50.83	.70	1.32
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	50.13		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	45.79	.18	.21
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	45.97		
		Large Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	25.22	.14	.33
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	25.08		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	22.64	.10	.16
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	22.54		
		Medium Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	17.09	.05	.17
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	17.04		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	15.82	.64	1.75
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	16.46		
		Small Argument			
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	8.52	.52	2.66**
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	8.00		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	7.33	.36	1.49
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	6.97		

**Significant at the 1% level.

TABLE XIII

COMPARATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLIMAX AND ANTI-CLIMAX ORDER ON CONVINCINGNESS RATINGS

Audience		N	Mean Convincingness Rating	Difference	t
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	5.49	.06	.21
Climax	(Experiment #1)	67	5.43		
Anti-Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	6.26	.29	.81
Climax	(Experiment #2)	39	5.97		

TABLE XIV

COMPARATIVE RESULTS FROM THREE STUDIES MEASURING THE RELATIVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CLIMAX AND ANTI-CLIMAX ORDER

	Sponberg Speech: Marriage N = 93			Experiment #1 Speech: Marriage Vote N = 67			Experiment #2 Speech: Vote N = 39		
ATTITUDE SHIFT:	*Diff.*	*Favors*	*Sig.*	*Diff.*	*Favors*	*Sig.*	*Diff.*	*Favors*	*Sig.*
Main Proposition	.05	Climax	No	.05	Climax	No	.29	Climax	5%
Large Argument	.61	Anti-Cl.	1%	.11	Anti-Cl.	No	.10	Climax	No
Medium Argument	.07	Climax	No	.17	Anti-Cl.	No	.11	Climax	No
Small Argument	.06	Anti-Cl.	No	.00	Even	No	.00	Even	No
RETENTION:									
Large Argument	.89	Anti-Cl.	1%	.14	Anti-Cl.	No	.10	Anti-Cl.	No
Medium Argument	.13	Anti-Cl.	No	.05	Anti-Cl.	No	.64	Climax	No
Small Argument	.25	Anti-Cl.	1%	.52	Anti-Cl.	1%	.36	Anti-Cl.	No
Total	1.24	Anti-Cl.	1%	.70	Anti-Cl.	No	.18	Climax	No
CONVINCINGNESS	.06	Anti-Cl.	No	.06	Anti-Cl.	No	.29	Anti-Cl.	No

Table XIII gives the results for the comparative effectiveness of the two forms of presentation on convincingness ratings. No significant differences appear in either study.

Table XIV is a summary of results of Sponberg's study and the two studies reported here.

So far as statistically significant differences are concerned, Experiment No. 1 and No. 2 give little support to Sponberg's outcomes. There are only two statistically significant differences and one of them favors climax order.

However, the outcomes should also be examined for consistency of trends. With regard to shift of opinion, Sponberg's outcomes showed no impressive superiority for either form of presentation, nor do Experiment No. 1 and No. 2. In regard to retention there are twelve comparisons of the two forms of presentation in the three studies combined and ten of these favor anti-climax order. In regard to ratings for convincingness anti-climax order was favored by all three studies.

IV

Thus in dealing with order as with authority, consistency of outcomes suggested the possibility that inclusion of additional subjects might yield "t's" which would justify rejection of the null hypothesis. But a fairly large number of subjects were employed and the question arises, why, in view of the supposed rhetorical value of authority and the previously demonstrated value of anti-climax order, didn't larger differences emerge.

Examination of the experiment suggested three conditions which might account for the smallness of the differences (if there are differences):

1. The speeches as a whole were clear statements in which the major propositions were supported by reasoning and evidence. The inclusion or exclusion of the names and identification of the authorities or the shifting of order might have been a small factor in relation to the total impact of the speech.

2. The listening task was easy, the speech being only about twenty minutes in length, with the retention test and ratings taken immediately.

3. The listeners probably were strongly motivated. Even though a considerable number indicated that they found the speech "dull," their behavior during the playback suggested active listening.

The first of these three conditions suggests that rhetorical experiments of this type are likely to produce only small differences. The reader may well say, granting the theoretical value of such outcomes, do they have any practical importance? The question is really outside the scope of this article. However, the writers are of the opinion that, when a person is confronted by a problem of communication, he should use the best means available even though its demonstrated superiority is small. And where mass communication is concerned—large scale selling and vote-getting on a state or national basis—a small difference in effectiveness of presentation might cause a very important difference in outcome.

THE FORUM

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Statler Hotel, New York City
December 27-30, 1953

The Speech Association of America transacted the following items of business:[1]

Elected new officers and members of the Council. [See complete list in the February issue of the *QJS*.]

Approved a revised budget of $49,125.00 for the current fiscal year, and $53,125.00 for the next fiscal year. [A copy of these budgets appears elsewhere in this department.]

Announced election by the membership of the following three people to the Nominating Committee: A. Craig Baird, Magdalene Kramer, Karl Robinson. The Executive Council elected two additional members: Charles Layton and Loren Reid. [The report of the Nominating Committee appears elsewhere in this department.]

Announced that Waldo Braden had been elected by the Executive Council (by mail ballot) to fill the position of Executive Secretary from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1957. Elected Henry R. Mueller editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the three-year period 1955-1957.

Decided to meet in Washington, D. C., in 1959, and in Denver, Colorado, in 1961, if satisfactory arrangements can be made. Instructed Committee on Time and Place to explore possible meeting places for 1960 and 1962. Confirmed arrangements to meet in Chicago in 1954, Los Angeles in 1955, Chicago in 1956 (all during last week in December), Boston in 1957 (last week in August), and Chicago in 1958 (last week in December).

Endorsed in principle the repeal of the tax on theatre admissions.

Decided that when a member of SAA who has held membership for twenty-five years or more reaches retirement age at his institution, he be issued an appropriately worded Gold Card, granting him henceforth free admission to our national conventions.

Received reports of officers and committees.

Heard other reports as follows: 1) from the Committee on Case Studies of Public Address on the Issue of Antislavery and Disunion that it has secured a publisher for its volume; 2) from the Committee on Background Studies in the History of Speech Education that its volume is almost ready for publication; 3) from the Committee on the History and Criticism of American Public Address (Vol. III) that its volume is now in press; 4) from a special committee that its report, "A Speech Program in the Secondary School," would appear in the January issue of *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals;* 5) from the Graduate Record Examination Committee that it has completed its work and that the tests in Speech are now available.

Also heard the report of the Committee on Structure. [See complete report elsewhere in this department.] The Council approved the general concept of the plan in principle and empowered the incoming President to appoint a committee to consider necessary revision of Constitution (the committee to report in the October *QJS* and the November *Speech Teacher*), the report to be considered by the Council at a meeting just prior to the 1954 Convention and voted on by the membership at a special business meeting at the Convention. At a business meeting the Association members voted that the proposal of the Committee on Structure be referred to the constitutional revision committee, without prejudice. The Association members also voted to refer the proposed constitutional amendment, published in the October, 1953, *QJS* and the November, 1953, *Speech Teacher,* to the constitutional revision committee.

Supported plan of Committee on Problems in the Secondary School to sponsor preparation of a course of study in speech fundamentals for the secondary school.

Approved proposal of Committee on History of American Public Address that it be given permission to appoint a subcommittee to pursue investigation of possible projects in the public address of the South.

Made changes in committee structure and

[1] A complete mimeographed copy of the minutes may be obtained from the Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, 12 E. Bloomington St., Iowa City, Iowa.

personnel. [See list of committees elsewhere in this department.]

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Nominating Committee of the Speech Association of America submits the following nominations for publication in the April issue of the *QJS:*

For President: Thomas A. Rousse, University of Texas. (As First Vice-President, Professor Rousse succeeds to the presidency under the provisions of the Constitution of the SAA.)

For First Vice-President: Lester Thonssen, College of the City of New York.

For Second Vice-President: Susie S. Niles, Salt Lake City Schools, Salt Lake City, Utah.

For Members of the Executive Council: Milton Dickens, University of Southern California; Willard J. Friederick, Marietta College; Charles A. McGlon, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary; Edythe Renshaw, Southern Methodist University.

Respectfully submitted:
Magdalene Kramer
Charles Layton
Loren Reid
Karl Robinson
A. Craig Baird, *Chairman*

OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA FOR 1954

(The chairman of each committee is named first. Members ex officio are listed in italics.)

I. Advisory Committees

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES: *Karl R. Wallace, Thomas Rousse, H. P. Constans, Elva Van Haitsma, Paul D. Bagwell, Waldo Braden, Jeffery Auer, Wilbur S. Howell, Dallas C. Dickey.*

FINANCE: Rupert L. Cortright (Chairman July 1, 1953, to July 1, 1954), James H. McBurney (Chairman July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955), Loren Reid, *Waldo Braden.*

PUBLICATIONS: William M. Sattler, Carl England, William McCoard, *Karl R. Wallace,* Frank Whiting, *Waldo Braden, Jeffery Auer, Wilbur S. Howell, Dallas C. Dickey, Paul D. Bagwell.*

TIME AND PLACE: Kenneth G. Hance, Milton Dickens, Barnard W. Hewitt, Elbert Harrington, Wesley Wiksell, *Waldo Braden.*

PUBLIC RELATIONS: Paul D. Bagwell, Magdalene Kramer, Andrew T. Weaver, *Karl R. Wallace, Waldo Braden.*

COMMITTEE ON POLICY: Rupert L. Cortright, James H. McBurney, Horace G. Rahskopf, Wilbur E. Gilman, Lionel G. Crocker, H. P. Contans.

II. Co-ordinating Committees

COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SAA AND OTHER RELATED ORGANIZATIONS: Thomas A. Rousse, Ralph Nichols, Hugo Hellman, Paul Moore, Hubert C. Heffner, Robert Schacht.

COMMITTEE ON CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SAA AND REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS: Paul D. Bagwell, and the Presidents of CSSA, WSSA, SSA, SAES, PSA.

III. Service Committees

CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC ADDRESS: A. Craig Baird, Lester Thonssen, John W. Bachman, Roy McCall, Thomas L. Dahle, Charles Redding, Theodore Kennedy, Ernest J. Wrage, Thomas Daly (Consultant, *Vital Speeches*).

INTERCOLLEGIATE DISCUSSION AND DEBATE: Robert G. Gunderson will be the SAA representative to January 1, 1955. The other members of the committee are representatives from TKA, PKD, DSR, and PRP. The chairmanship rotates.

TEACHING SPEECH TO FOREIGN STUDENTS: Albert T. Cordray, Gifford Blyton, James Abel, Henry Moser, Ivan Putman, Jr.

INTERNATIONAL DISCUSSION AND DEBATE: Annabel Dunham Hagood, Gordon F. Hostettler, Halbert Gulley, Margaret Wood, Alan Nichols, Paul Carmack, Brooks Quimby, Franklin R. Shirley, Mildred E. Adams (Consultant, Institute of International Education).

COMMITTEE ON DISCUSSION AND GROUP METHODS: William E. Utterback, Franklyn S. Haiman, Carroll C. Arnold, John W. Keltner, H. L. Ewbank, Sr., Kim Giffin, Helen Schrader, N. Edd Miller, Dean C. Barnlund.

COMMITTEE ON ARCHIVES: L. Leroy Cowperthwaite, J. Jeffery Auer, Lester Thonssen, *Waldo Braden.*

IV. Study Committees

HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION: Edyth Renshaw, Bert Emsley, Ota Thomas Reynolds, Giles W. Gray, Clarence Edney, Douglas Ehninger.

HISTORY OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: George V. Bohman, Robert D. Clark, Dallas C. Dickey, J. Garber Drushal, Marie K. Hochmuth, Donald C. Bryant, W. Norwood Brigance, J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, H. L. Ewbank, Sr., Ernest J. Wrage, Laura Crowell, Hollis L. White, Lindsey S. Perkins.

PROBLEMS IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL: Mardel Ogilvie, C. Agnes Rigney, Elise Hahn, Geraldine Garrison, John J. Pruis, Jean Conyers Ervin, Zelda Horner Kosh.

PROBLEMS IN SECONDARY SCHOOL: Evelyn Konigsberg, Yetta Mitchell, Waldo W. Phelps, Oliver W. Nelson, Mary Blackburn, Charles L. Balcer, Freda Kenner, Lawrence S. Jenness, Hayden K. Carruth, Bea Olmstead, Mrs. O. J. Whitworth.

PROBLEMS IN UNDERGRADUATE STUDY: Donald E. Hargis, Mildred F. Berry, William H. Perkins, A. L. Thurman, Jr., H. L. Ewbank, Jr., Roberta Buchanan, Robert A. Johnston, Arthur Eisenstadt, Wilbur Moore, Alan W. Huckleberry, Solomon Simonson.

PROBLEMS IN GRADUATE STUDY: Magdalene Kramer, Clyde W. Dow, Claude Kantner, Horace Rahskopf, Norman Philbrick.

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING SPEECH TO PREACHERS: Charles A. McGlon, Charles E. Weniger, Fred J. Barton, George William Smith, Lowell G. McCoy, John J. Rudin II, Fr. Edward P. Atzert, Abraham Tauber.

PROBLEMS IN RADIO AND TELEVISION: E. Wm. Ziebarth, Forest L. Whan, D. Glenn Starlin, James D. Davis, Ola Hiller, Otis Walter, Marguerite Fleming, John Roberts, Sydney Head. (Authorized to name two consultants.)

PROBLEMS IN TEACHING SPEECH IN THE ARMED SERVICES: (Chairman to be named.) Earnest Brandenburg, Ralph E. Frybarger, Eugene E. Myers, C. David Cornell, George Batka, H. Hardy Perritt, Paul R. Beall.

PROBLEMS IN MOTION PICTURES AND VISUAL AIDS: Karl F. Robinson, Harold Nelson, C. R. Carpenter, H. Barrett Davis, Clair R. Tettemer, John Dietrich.

PROBLEMS IN VOICE SCIENCE: Clarence Simon, Eleanor Luse, Dorothy Huntington, Gordon Peterson, T. D. Hanley, Charlotte G. Wells.

PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE IN SPEECH: Ross Scanlan, Robert T. Oliver, Howard Gilkinson, Orville L. Pence, Milton Dickens.

PROBLEMS IN PHONETICS: Hilda Fisher, William R. Tiffany, Gladys E. Lynch, C. K. Thomas, Malcolm C. Coxe.

PROBLEMS IN INTERPRETATION: Althea Smith Mattingly, Garff Wilson (Vice-Chairman), Charlotte Lee (Secretary), John Van Meter, Ray Irwin, Frederick C. Packard.

PROBLEMS IN PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE: Joseph O'Brien, Alice Sturgis, Carl Dallinger, Kenneth Shanks, Charley A. Leistner, Wayne Brockriede, James L. Golden.

PROBLEMS IN ADULT EDUCATION: Wesley Wiksell, Harold P. Zelko, James N. Holm, Charles T. Estes, Harold O. Haskett, P. E. Lull, Franklin Knower, Earnest Brandenburg, Cyril Hager.

V. PROJECT COMMITTEES

VOLUME OF BACKGROUND STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION IN AMERICA: Karl R. Wallace, Warren Guthrie, Frederick W. Haberman, Barnard Hewitt, Harold Westlake, C. M. Wise.

VOLUME III of *The History and Criticism of American Public Address:* Marie K. Hochmuth, Donald C. Bryant, W. Norwood Brigance.

VOLUME OF STUDIES OF PUBLIC ADDRESS ON THE ISSUE OF ANTISLAVERY AND DISUNION *circa* 1860: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, H. L. Ewbank, Sr.

VOLUME OF STUDIES IN THE COLONIAL PERIOD OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS: George V. Bohman, Dallas C. Dickey, Ernest J. Wrage.

MICROFILMING OF RESOURCE MATERIALS IN THE FIELD OF SPEECH: Albert E. Johnson, Frederick W. Haberman, George R. Kernodle, William W. Melnitz, Hubert C. Heffner, Richard Moody, Robert Dierlam

VI. *Ad Hoc* COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON CODE OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS: Richard Murphy, Claude E. Kantner, Wilbur E. Gilman, Lester L. Hale, Horace Robinson.

COMMITTEE ON LIAISON WITH NCTE: (Committee to be named).

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AT 1953 CONVENTION

	Revised Budget 1953-54	Tentative Budget 1954-55
Publications:		
Quarterly Journal	$ 9,500	$ 9,500
Speech Monographs	3,500	3,500
Annual Directory	2,750	2,750
Special Printing	600	1,300
Repurchase of Old Copies	150	150
Speech Teacher	4,000	4,000
Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	1,400	1,500

New Solicitations	750	600
Renewals	150	150
Placement	400	500
Convention	2,500	2,000
Sustaining Members		
Personnel:		
Officers and Committees	1,500	1,700
Secretary and Clerical	11,000	14,500
Dues and Fees:		
American Council on Educ.	100	100
AETA Share of Convention Fee	500	
Commissions and Discounts	1,700	1,700
Bank Charges	25	25
Secretary's Bond and Audit	150	150
Other Expenses:		
Postage and Distribution	3,500	3,500
Binding	600	600
Office Supplies and Service	1,200	1,200
Insurance	200	250
Office Equipment	400	200
Convention Expense	1,500	1,000
Reserve Fund	500	500
Contingency	500	500
Interest on Notes	50	50
Moving National Office		1,200
	49,125	53,125

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON STRUCTURE, ANNUAL CONVENTION, 1953

Paul Bagwell, *Chairman*

The Committee on Structure submits the following proposed plan of organization for the SAA. We propose that the Council approve the general outline of this plan; and that a constitutional committee be appointed to work out the details of constitutional revision necessary to implement this proposal; and that this committee publish its report in the *QJS* in October, 1954; and that a special two-day constitutional convention be called two days prior to the opening of the 1954 Annual Convention of the Association to consider the adoption of this plan.

OUTLINE OF THE PLAN

The Legislative Assembly

A policy-making representative body known as the Legislative Assembly.

Membership

1. One representative from each of the states elected by the Regional Associations plus members at large in the proportion of one delegate to every 300 SAA members.
2. Representatives from each of the Regional Associations. (5). (The Regional Presidents).
3. Fifteen representatives elected at large from the general membership.
4. Two representatives from each Area Group (Vice-Chairman and Secretary).
5. One representative from each of the four affiliated organizations (ASHA, AETA, AFA, NSSC). The representatives to be elected in the way prescribed for the other officers of the affiliated organizations. (83-105).

Function

1. To determine general policy for the Association.
2. To determine dues.
3. To define the function and scope of the journals.
4. To hear and act upon reports of Area Groups and other assembly committees.
5. To determine time and place of annual meeting.
6. To meet jointly with the Executive Council to hear the report of the Budget Committee.
7. Standing committees: Credentials, Resolutions, Policy, Publications, Committee on Committees (Past and Present National Officers).
   a. Policy Committee: Composed of the five immediate past presidents.
   b. Publications: composed of three current editors, three immediate past editors and four members named by the Assembly.
8. Elect one member of nominating committee of the Association.

The Executive Council

The administrative body of the Association.

Membership

1. President.
2. Two past presidents.
3. First Vice-President (Program Chairman).
4. Second Vice-President (Speaker of the Assembly) (Elected by membership annually). (The second Vice-President becomes First Vice-President and then President).
5. Editors and immediate past editors of the publications. (Editors elected by the Executive Council and approved by the Legislative Assembly for 3-year terms).
6. Executive Vice-President (elected by the Executive Council and approved by the Legislative Assembly for 3-year terms).

7. Executive Secretary (elected by the Executive Council and approved by the Legislative Assembly for 3-year terms).
8. Immediate past Executive Vice-President and Executive Secretary.
9. One each from the Area Groups. (Chairmen of these groups.)
10. One each from the Affiliated Associations, (to be elected . . .). (31-34).

Function

1. To administer the finances of the organization through a finance committee.
2. Publish the journal through their editors.
3. Handle all public relations for the Association.
4. Handle liaison activities for the Association.
5. Approve the petition of Area Groups for representation in the Legislative Assembly and submit this to the Legislative Assembly for final approval and seating of the representatives.
6. Approve petitions of State Associations for representation in the Legislative Assembly and submit this to the Legislative Assembly for final approval and seating of representatives.
7. Elect one member of the nominating committee and administer the election of three members of the nominating committee from the general membership.
8. Organize and administer the Annual Convention.

AREA GROUPS

To facilitate the accomplishment of the purposes of the Association and to assist in the planning of the convention program, areas of interest and teaching levels may be organized within the SAA. These areas are called *Area Groups*. Area Groups may be approved for membership in the Legislative Assembly and the Executive Council by petition to the Executive Council defining the scope of the area and listing the members who are interested in work in that area. Such areas as the following may be recognized: Secondary School Speech Teachers; Elementary School Teachers; College, University and Graduate Teachers; Adult Speech Education Basic Courses; Speech Education; Rhetoric and Public Address; Forensics; Discussion; Communication; Oral Interpretation; Theatre and Drama; Radio and Television; Linguistic Science and Phonetics; Psychology and Speech Science; Speech and Hearing Disorders; and others as determined by need and interest.

Each group shall be guided by an Area Executive Committee composed of a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, and three members elected by the Area Group for a term of three years. A succession from Secretary to Vice-Chairman to Chairman should be established. An election would be held each year.

The Chairman is the representative on the Executive Council, and the Vice-Chairman and Secretary are representatives in the Legislative Assembly.

The Vice-Chairman shall plan the annual convention program for that area.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

Three members of the nominating committee would be elected as at present. Two additional members shall be elected, one by the Executive Council, and one by the Legislative Assembly.

AMERICAN ENGLISH IN EUROPE

To the Editor:

Professor Cabell Greet's view of the situation with regard to American English in Europe (see *QJS*, Dec. 1953), which I had the pleasure of discussing with him before the end of my recent visit to the United States, seems to me unduly pessimistic. To say that "Except in Istanbul, no academic interest in American English is apparent" is to leave out of account at least one Dutch, and certainly more than one German university. The full facts will appear when the results of Professor Sigmund Skard's survey of the position of Ameri-

can studies in Europe, now in progress at the University of Oslo, are put before the public.

I cannot agree either that "European teachers mean by 'Standard English Speech' the textbooks of Daniel Jones and his remarkable colleagues in University College a generation and more ago." Jones and his colleagues described a type of speech used by most educated people in the south of England, and to that extent "standard," and therefore taught in European schools. (That some British professors were unable to recognize their own pronunciation in Jones's transcriptions is neither here nor there.) This is not to deny that other types of English, such as the Scotch, the American, and the Australian, may be equally "standard" within their own domain; but in countries like Holland and Denmark, where a language teacher is expected to speak the foreign language (as nearly as possible) like a native, *one* type of English has to be taught; and for historical, geographical, and other reasons, that type has so far been educated southern English. Even if it should be thought advisable to replace the British by the American type (which?) in European schools, such a measure, owing to the lack of American-trained teachers, would probably result, as far as pronunciation and vocabulary are concerned, in an odd mixture that was neither one nor the other. "That," Professsor Greet might retort, "is exactly what is happening." But to *promote* confusion can never be the aim of either academic or secondary teaching. On the contrary, the only procedure in agreement with the present situation in Europe seems to be: to go on teaching the British type of English as far as practical mastery is concerned; to emphasize the increasing importance of the American type; to teach students (for information, not for adoption) the main distinctive features of American English, as regards pronunciation, vocabulary, and syntax. That is what is actually being done in at least one European university, at the opposite end of the continent from Istanbul.

R. W. Zandvoort,
University of Groningen

REPLY TO PROFESSOR ZANDVOORT

To the Editor:

The anniversary pictures of the dreadful floods in the Netherlands had brought to mind my friend Professor R. W. Zandvoort of Groningen and, in contrast to the disaster, the pleasure we took in his recent visit to the United States, where he went from Atlantic to Pacific, and bravely attended everything, including conventions in Chicago and a New Year's Eve in Times Square. He gave my class a memorable address on dialects (or languages) in the Netherlands, and he could have told us a lot about editing a professional magazine. *English Studies*, of which he is a founder and editor, is admirable.

As I was thinking of Zandvoort, I received a copy of his letter to the Editor, gently protesting "as unduly pessimistic" my comments on the academic place of American English in Europe, during my travels 1950-52. I am delighted that remarks of mine should prompt Zandvoort to reply, because he is just the man to consider whether American English should have a place in the crowded curricula of European schools and universities. The problem seems to me a mirror-image of our own worries as to how majors in American studies and in modern literatures can find time for adequate work in fields before 1830.

Almost all Europeans whom I know think of America and the English language in America as a provincial sprout of the parent English (and European) stock. Someday, somehow, European teachers will realize, I believe, that the twig that came out of the tree trunk in the seventeenth century is now as great and as worthy of attention as any other part of the tree. This does not mean that the tree is asymmetrical, except to those whose hindsight contradicts ordinary perception. It does mean that study of seventeenth-century English thought and eighteenth-century English language is incomplete without study of the institutions and the language of the United States.

As I read Professor Zandvoort's letter, I am not sure that even at Groningen is the myth dead of America's provincialism—the myth that inclines Europeans to wonder "Why should Americans expect American English to be taken seriously outside of America?" It tempts Europeans to say so often, by way of compliment, "*You* don't speak like an American." There are variations, such as "You don't dress like an American," and so on. However, the focus is usually on our language, our speech, even in countries where our contemporary writing is highly valued, perhaps overvalued. I think this is both silly and dangerous. And I write about it because, as I have said before (*Word Study*, October 1952), our own attitude is in some measure responsible for the myth. At the convention of the Modern Language Association in Boston, December, 1952, a German insisted that American officials encouraging his teaching at Frankfort had told him that American English had no importance for students of America. When I protested, he looked on me as a sad Jingo. Indeed I am sorry for any teacher or any statesman who thinks that a spoken language is unrelated to its literature and its government.

With Professor Zandvoort we await the publication of Professor Sigmund Skard's survey of the position of American studies in Europe. I hope that Professor Skard, who most hospitably invited me to lecture at Oslo in April, 1951, will say quite specifically where, and how much, instruction is given in Europe on the English language in America, and in what countries does American English speech satisfy the oral examination for the license to teach English.

I cannot share Professor Zandvoort's opinion that only one variety of English can be taught efficiently in a country or a university or even a department. One variety seldom is. However, he has certainly had more experience than I in teaching English as a foreign language.

While professors debate, travel by plane has brought Amsterdam almost as near New York as the Hook is to Harwick in bad weather. I have heard it said that the compromise that some Europeans are now making between British and American English, with a dash of the Antipodes and India, "this continental English," is the first orchestration of a world English to come—nay, which is with us, though untaught in schools. I have the sly thought that perhaps some of Professor Zandvoort's colleagues may have detected a slight American flavor when he returned home. I hope so, and I hope that he will come to see us again and again.

I plead guilty to the fault of using "academic" and "standard English" as if they were not weasel words. I ought to have added the italicized words, "Except in Istanbul, no academic *approval of the use of* [for "interest in"] American

English *in an English class or oral examination* is apparent."

As for "Standard English," whatever we teachers mean or do not mean by the phrase, the irony of Daniel Jones' victory is a fine jest. And the moral for young teachers is that what you believe you should write in treatises and textbooks, and always you should be unsparing in your teaching of teachers. That is, if you wish to win victories.

W. CABELL GREET,
Barnard College
Columbia University

THE FIRST BOYLSTON PROFESSOR SPEAKS ON DELIVERY

It would not be consistent with the purpose of these lectures to enter minutely into the consideration of these particulars, relating to the mechanical part of public speaking. The rules for placing the proper accent upon words, for marking the emphatic words of a sentence, for pausing at the proper places, and for modulating the voice by the rising, the falling, and the reciprocal inflection, are generally contained in those elementary books, which are in the hand of every school-boy. Their attainment however in that perfection, to which those of you, who are destined to oratorical profession, will, I hope, steadily aspire, can only be accomplished by assiduous and persevering practice; by observation of the manner, which distinguishes the most eminent public speakers; and by continual comparison between your observation and your practice; and between both and the principles, elucidated by the writers, who have investigated most thoroughly the subject. The elements of criticism by Lord Kaimes, and the various writings of Sheridan and Walker upon elocution and the art of reading, will deserve your particular attention and study. Between Sheridan and Walker you will find many differences of opinion, not quite so important, as the latter of these writers appears to believe them. . . . You may perhaps sometimes not be able easily to settle in your own minds the points of contest; but they will not lead to any very serious perplexity, if, in reading these rival rhetoricians, you recollect the instruction of Lord Bacon; and "read, not to contradict and refute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."

From these writers may be collected also the rules of gesture, as far as they have been made in modern times a subject of positive precept. But of all the treatises upon this part of delivery the most complete and most methodical, that has ever come to my notice, is the third chapter of the eleventh book of Quinctilian's institutes. It is long and very minute; containing not only the necessary injunctions for the management of the voice, but particular rules for the government of every feature and member of the body, which may concur to the end of public oratory. He considers the modes of gesture likewise in regard to all the possible directions, which can be given them; as right and left, up and down, forward and backward; pointing out which of these are most easy and most frequently suitable. He directs the accommodation of the voice and gesture to each other, and of both to the subject; to the several parts of the discourse; to the thoughts and sentiments of the speaker; and to the words of his discourse. He gives also the post particular directions for the dress of the orator; how he is to manage the folds of his gown; and how he is to wear the rings upon his fingers. Much of this no doubt is useless for the practice of our age and country. Much of it is interesting only as evidence of the importance, given in the most flourishing ages of eloquence to objects apparently trivial; and of the study, lavished upon the most insignificant trifles at the time, when the art was in its decay.

John Quincy Adams, *Lectures on Rhetoric and Oratory*, 11, 383-386.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

MATERIALS IN GROUP DYNAMICS

Franklyn S. Haiman

The understandable eagerness of teachers of speech to grapple with the many controversial issues posed by what has come to be known as the "group dynamics" movement—to debate the validity of its training methods and to inquire into its philosophical implications—has led to both healthy and unfortunate consequences in our profession. On the asset side, these discussions and debates have brought into the open some fundamental issues which merit examination. Newer and older ideas, alike, are being submitted to the rigorous testing that results from lively argument. As for the unhappy consequence, in the process of discussing the questions of educational and social philosophy raised by *training* programs such as that offered by the National Training Laboratory in Group Development at Bethel, Maine (or in "group dynamics" in the narrow sense), a very substantial aspect of the study of group dynamics is being lost in the shuffle. It is the part that has to do with the *research* attempts by social psychologists, whether labelled "group dynamicists" or not, to build a scientifically tested and testable body of laws and hypotheses regarding the behavior of small groups. It may be that lack of acquaintance with this material is a cause for its neglect in our professional discussions, and that a review of significant and available literature will be helpful in reminding us that the study of group dynamics is a rapidly developing research area.

The initial fact that impresses one as he surveys the literature of group dynamics (in the broader sense) is the wide variety of approaches to the field. First, we find variety in the segments of group behavior which have been selected for study. For example, Asch has chosen to focus on that aspect of the group process that has to do with the operation of social pressures;[1] Bavelas has concerned himself with patterns of communication;[2] and Thelen, with emotional sub-grouping.[3] Obviously these are not entirely discrete phenomena, and the student who reads the literature is faced with the necessity of finding the interrelations for himself. Adding to the difficulty of this task is the variety of terminology used. For instance, George Homans, one writer in the field, talks about the "internal and external systems" of a group;[4] while R. F. Bales refers to essentially the same phenomena (in this reader's view) by the labels

[1] S. E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," in *Groups, Leadership and Men*, ed. Harold Guetzkow (Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951).

[2] Alex Bavelas, "Communication Patterns in Task-Oriented Groups," *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, XXII (1950), 725-730.

[3] Herbert Thelen, et al., *The Application of Bionic Theory to the Study of Small Groups* (Dittoed publication of the Human Dynamics Laboratory, University of Chicago).

[4] George C. Homans, *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1950).

"social-emotional and task areas."[5] There is also great variety in the methods of investigation being employed. Some, like Homans, have relied heavily on the field or case study for their data. Others, like Bales, attempt to record and categorize interactions among the members of a group in a laboratory setting. Still others, like Jennings, place emphasis on the use of questionnaires;[6] or, like the Adorno group, use attitude measurements and clinical interviews.[7]

Space does not permit an exhaustive coverage of all the published studies of group behavior. It will be necessary to select those works which appear to be of most significance to the student who is particularly interested in the psychology of discussion groups. This will involve a number of value judgments for which the reviewer must take responsibility.

The best place to begin is with a recent volume entitled *Group Dynamics: Research and Theory* by Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander.[8] Although the authors are director and program director, respectively, of the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan, this book is an eclectic anthology. Its introductory section describes for the reader some of the major theoretical orientations that have been used in studying groups—the factor analysis approach, the interactionist approach, the psychoanalytic orientation, and the sociometric view. This is followed by a number of chapters in which are reprinted articles representing each of these approaches. Later sections of the volume are devoted to such topics as group cohesiveness, group pressures, group goals, group structure, and leadership. Each section is introduced with a general statement of concepts and hypotheses by the editors, couched largely in Lewinian terms, followed by reprints of significant experimental studies relating to the topic of that section. The net effect of the volume is to give the reader a feeling for the range of problems that are being studied, the kinds of experimental designs that have been devised to study them, the findings that have resulted, and the theoretical formulations which may be drawn from them.

A few chapters of this work might be cited as being of particular interest to those concerned primarily with the discussion group. One is the study by John R. P. French, Jr., of the "Disruption and Cohesion of Groups," wherein comparisons are made between unorganized and organized groups in response to frustrating problem situations.[9] Another, by S. E. Asch, "Effects of Group Pressure upon the Modification and Distortion of Judgments," ingeniously measures the ways in which various kinds of majority pressures operate to influence a group member.[10] In a chapter by Leon Festinger, entitled "Informal Social Communication," a series of interesting hypotheses concerning the relationship between pressures toward uniformity in a group and communication patterns is set forth.[11] A study by Stanley Schacter reports the effects on communication of manipulating such variables as group cohesiveness, and relevance to group goals of the is-

[5] R. F. Bales, *Interaction Process Analysis* (Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Press, 1950).

[6] Helen Hall Jennings, *Leadership and Isolation* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950).

[7] T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. Levinson, and R. Sanford, *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).

[8] (Evanston: Row, Peterson, 1953).

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 121-134.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 151-162.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 190-203.

sues discussed.[12] Morton Deutsch deals in both a theoretical and experimental way with "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition upon Group Process."[13] A chapter by Alex Bavelas, referred to earlier in this paper, studies the effects of different kinds of communication patterns upon the efficiency of group performance and upon group morale. Finally, there is included the now classic study of autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire leadership by Ralph White and Ronald Lippitt.[14]

Two other collections of experimental studies are worthy of our attention, although there is some overlap with the studies included in Cartwright and Zander. The first is entitled *Groups, Leadership and Men*, edited by Harold Guetzkow.[15] This book reports the research in human relations sponsored by the Office of Naval Research from 1945 to 1950. Although the major focus of these studies is on leadership, much of the information presented is pertinent to the discussion situation. The other volume, well known in the field of psychology, is the revised edition (1952) of *Readings in Social Psychology*, edited by Guy E. Swanson, Theodore M. Newcomb, and Eugene Hartley.[16] Although this work as a whole is not directly related to the dynamics of the small discussion group, many of its studies bear indirectly upon the problem, and some quite directly. In the latter category are: a study by Harold Leavitt, "Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance," which follows the lines of Bavelas' work referred to earlier;[17] a study by Leon Festinger and John Thibaut, "Interpersonal Communication in Small Groups," which puts to an experimental test some of the hypotheses set forth by Festinger in his chapter in Cartwright and Zander;[18] and an older study, done in 1932, by Marjorie Shaw, "A Comparison of Individuals and Small Groups in the Rational Solution of Complex Problems."[19]

Mention might also be made at this point of experimental studies in group discussion conducted by people in the field of speech; but since most of them have been reviewed in this journal previously,[20] or will appear in a forthcoming issue of *Speech Monographs* being edited by the S.A.A. Committee on Discussion and Group Methods, space will not be used here for them. Nor will space be taken to describe again the early works in group dynamics, such as those of Kurt Lewin, which were reviewed for our readers by Herbert C. Kelman in "Group Dynamics—Neither Hope nor Hoax."[21]

Let us, instead, look somewhat more closely at the writings of a few current leaders in the field whose work is perhaps not well enough known to our profession. One of the most productive institutions for the study of group behavior at the present time (along with the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, from which the bulk of materials already alluded to in this review has emanated) is Harvard University. Robert Freed Bales, of Harvard's Department of Social Relations, has been a pioneer in the attempt to achieve objective measurement

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 223-248. The study is entitled "Deviation, Rejection, and Communication."
[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 319-353.
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 585-611. The study is entitled "Leader Behavior and Member Reaction in Three 'Social Climates.'"
[15] See above, note 1.
[16] (New York: Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1952).
[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 108-125.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 125-134.
[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 135-146.
[20] J. Jeffery Auer, "Recent Literature in Discussion," *QJS*, XXXIX (February, 1953), 95-98.
[21] *QJS*, XXXVI (October, 1950), 371-377.

of the interaction that takes place in a discussion group. His book, *Interaction Process Analysis,* to which I have already referred, not only describes a research *method* which has been imitated, with modifications, by other scholars; but it presents, in its final chapter, a series of generalized laws about group behavior which deserve far more attention than they have received. His analysis of the relations among group solidarity, differentiation of roles, and fluctuations between task and social-emotional orientations, furnishes basic insights into the functioning of large societies as well as small groups.

Another Harvard professor, George Homans of the department of sociology, has made an important contribution in his book, *The Human Group.* Homans describes for his readers in considerable detail what might be called case histories of five groups from which data have been obtained by well-known field studies. One is the study of *Street Corner Society* by William Foote Whyte.[22] Another is from the famous research at the Western Electric Hawthorne Plant.[23] Using these groups as models, Homans attempts to draw up a body of generalized principles which will be true of all group behavior. Whether or not one believes that he has succeeded in this effort is not as interesting as the fact that he has tried, and thus has made a beginning toward the goal which will eventually have to be reached if group dynamics is ever to achieve the status of a science.

Another currently productive center for research in group dynamics is the Human Dynamics Laboratory at the University of Chicago, under the direction of Herbert Thelen. Unfortunately nothing is available as yet from this group in book form. A series of papers, read at the American Psychological Association meetings in 1953, has been reproduced, however, and is now in the process of being expanded into published monograph form.[24] The work of Thelen's group, though experimental in nature, has a distinctly psychoanalytic flavor. The application of psychoanalytic theory to group behavior goes back to Freud himself, and has been ably reviewed in a relatively recent book by Saul Scheidlinger.[25] But Thelen's research is based more directly upon the theoretical formulations of a contemporary British psychoanalyst named Bion, whose work has been primarily with therapy groups. Bion's observations were first reported in extremely obscure terms in a group of articles running through the first five volumes of *Human Relations,* a journal published jointly by the Research Center for Group Dynamics and the Tavistock Institute of London, England. A much clearer statement of his theories, however, has since been published;[26] and the work of the Chicago group has also contributed to bringing scientific order out of Bion's original chaos. It is difficult to characterize the nature of these studies in a few words, other than to say that a group's emotional climate is the focus of attention. Among other things, attempts are being made to measure the whys and wherefores of emotional subgroupings.

Two other bodies of psychiatrically-oriented literature, though perhaps not commonly related to group dynamics,

22 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943).

23 F. J. Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson, *Management and the Worker* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939).

24 Herbert Thelen, et al. See above, note 3.

25 *Psychoanalysis and Group Behavior* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1952).

26 W. R. Bion, "Group Dynamics: A Review," *International Journal of Psychoanalysis,* XXXIII (1952), 235-247.

impress this reviewer as shedding much light on the small group process.

The first of these is the research known to social psychologists as studies of the "authoritarian personality." Sponsored by the American Jewish Committee over a two-and-a-half-year period of time, and involving the collaborative efforts of many scholars, the project is reported in full detail in a massive volume published by Harper.[27] This reviewer, in a research project of his own now in process, has already obtained considerable evidence to indicate a correlation between the authoritarian personality, as measured by the Adorno group, and attitudes toward discussion leadership.

The second body of materials is that emanating from the "interpersonal" school of psychiatry, led by Harry Stack Sullivan and his students. A good deal of research now in progress at various psychology departments throughout the country has been influenced, directly or indirectly, by Sullivan's work. An idea of the nature of his concepts can be obtained from some of the chapters in a collection entitled *A Study of Interpersonal Relations*.[28] Of most pertinence to the student of group dynamics are the papers by Ernest Beaglehole, "Interpersonal Theory and Social Psychology,"[29] and by Sullivan himself, "Psychiatry: Introduction to the Study of Interpersonal Relations."[30]

Many other sources of material relating to group dynamics might be discussed. Muzafer Sherif of the University of Oklahoma, and his wife, Carolyn W. Sherif, have recently published an interesting book entitled *Groups in Harmony and Tension*,[31] which clarifies relationships between *intra* and *inter*-group phenomena. It is likely that the next few years will see an ever-increasing flow of publications, as research now in progress all over the nation is completed.[32] Perhaps the best way to keep abreast of this material is to follow the articles and reviews in *Human Relations*, in the *Journal of Social Issues*, and in the standard psychology, sociology, and educational research journals.

At the outset of this paper a distinction was made between group dynamics as a field of social science *research* and "group dynamics" as methodologies of training and action. Our concern in this review has been primarily with the former. Before concluding, however, I should like to enumerate a number of other publications which may prove helpful to those readers more interested in the latter.

Many points of view about training and action might be examined, but only a few of the most prominent will be mentioned here. A paper-bound book, *Explorations in Human Relations Training*, describing in considerable detail the philosophy, methods, and six years of experience of the Bethel laboratory, can be purchased from the National Training Laboratory in Group Development, 1201 Sixteenth St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. The *Adult Leadership* magazine, published monthly by the Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 743 N. Wabash Ave., Chicago, Ill., is another helpful source. A pro-

[27] Adorno, et al. See above, note 7.
[28] (New York: Hermitage Press, 1949).
[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 50-79.
[30] *Ibid.*, pp. 98-121.
[31] (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953).

[32] Centers devoted exclusively to work in this area have sprung up and are still springing up in many places. A few examples are the Fels Group Dynamics Center at Temple University, under the direction of Stanford Kight; the Human Relations Center at Boston University, under the direction of Kenneth Benne; the Center for Human Relations Studies of New York University, led by H. Harry Giles; and the Center for the Improvement of Group Procedures at Columbia University, directed by Kenneth Herrold.

vocative criticism of some Bethel techniques, *Leadership and Group Participation,* by William F. Whyte, has been printed in pamphlet form by the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., and can be purchased by mail from that address. Classroom teachers may find still another approach to be interesting—namely that described by Nathaniel Cantor in his *Dynamics of Learning.*[33] Also, one should include on his reading list an exposition of the "non-directive" approach to groups, best exemplified by two chapters in *Client-Centered Therapy*—one entitled "Group Centered Leadership and Administration" by Thomas Gordon,[34] and the other entitled "Student-Centered Teaching," by Carl Rogers.[35] Finally, if one wishes to understand the philosophy which motivates many of the people working in the field of group dynamics, whether at the research, training, or action levels, he will find it enlightening to read Erich Fromm's *Escape from Freedom.*[36]

ROGER WILLIAMS. By Perry Miller. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1953; pp. xiii+273. $3.00.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN. By I. Bernard Cohen. Indianpolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1953; pp. xix+320. $3.00.

ANDREW JACKSON. By Harold C. Syrett. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1953; pp. 298. $3.00.

These three volumes are the first published in the Makers of the American Tradition Series under the general editorship of Hiram Haydn and Donald Bigelow. Additional books in preparation or planned are to deal with Alexander Hamilton (by John Allen Krout), John Dewey (by Irwin Edman), Thomas Jefferson, Cotton Mather, John C. Calhoun, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William James, and others.

Students of public address will welcome these fresh appraisals of the contributions of selected leaders to the American tradition. The three works reviewed here augur well for those to come. Each is written by a specialist but he has written for that pervasive general reader, "the literate American of whatever age and description." Each author has, however, exemplified the best features of scholarship—clear writing, careful documentation, and honest objectivity. A valuable feature of the series is the inclusion of large amounts of original sources—letters, speeches, memoranda and, in the case of Franklin, descriptions of his inventions.

We do not usually think of Roger Williams, Benjamin Franklin, or Andrew Jackson as orators or even as important public speakers. But whoever takes the trouble to read these critical biographies cannot fail to discern the large part that writing and speaking contributed to the development of each man. Each became a stylist in his own right. Each influenced by the power of character and the force of utterance his fellow men. All were largely self taught and probably none of the three ever studied rhetoric in a formal way. Yet we recognize in a document like Andrew Jackson's protest, "The President is the Direct Representative of the American People" (15 April 1834), an extremely cogent defense of the powers of the President. Its effectiveness grows out of the man, the occasion, the persons addressed, and the arguments themselves. Invention, Arrangement, and Style are conscripted and vitalized by the event. Jackson's vigorous attack of the Senate's own acts explains why the Senate refused to enter the "protest" in its "Journal." The message is truly an instance of a man and his opposition making rhetoric, in which he had no training, work for him.

Other parts that will interest teachers of speech are the expositions of the campaigns of 1824, 1828 and 1832, Jackson's views of States' Rights, and his disagreement with his cabinet over Peggy Eaton. In the case of the Franklin volume we find value in the sections on Franklin's ability to compromise, his views on freedom of speech and press, and his speech moving the unanimous acceptance of the Constitution. Roger Williams' ideas about religious liberty are of continuing interest to this day.

Each volume contains a good bibliography and an index. The design and the printing are exceptionally attractive. Each writer creates by his own style and his discriminating use of the

[33] (Buffalo: Foster and Stewart, 1946).
[34] Pp. 320-383. This work was published in 1951 at Boston by Houghton Mifflin Company.
[35] Pp. 384-428.
[36] (New York: Rinehart, 1941).

materials a desire for us to know more about his subject. These books are refreshing examples of the dictum that scholarship need not be dull.

H. F. Harding,
Ohio State University

THE STATESMANSHIP OF THE CIVIL WAR. By Allan Nevins. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953; pp. 82. $2.25.

These three essays, delivered in 1951 as the Page-Barbour Lectures at the University of Virginia, Allan Nevins describes as "primarily an invitation to thought on the questions of statesmanship in time of crisis, and a modest indication of some of the forces which elevate or depress statecraft." In them he develops first "The Conditions of Statesmanship," then considers "The Southern Dilemma," and concludes with "Lincoln As More Than a Statesman."

The opening lecture is a delightful and wise development of the thesis that success and ability are inadequate measures of a statesman, that the truly vital test is whether "his motives, skill, and prevision were of heroic quality." There is more than a small echo of classical rhetorical doctrine in Nevins' insistence that the true leader must have not only an appreciation of moral values, but some kind of passion: without it he may meet his problems with sober practical wisdom, but never with inspiration. Beyond this, the statesman can be identified if he bears "a constructive relation to the emergent forces of his era."

The leader in American politics, as Nevins sees him, must be a molder of public opinion, with an instinctive understanding of the masses, able to divine the hopes, fears, moods, appetites, and opinions of a democracy in time of crisis. Thus, among various specialized qualities of leadership, "eloquence counts for much, power of pen for more, and parliamentary skill, expertness in party management, and governmental experience each have real if shifting values." Students of public address may regret that Nevins, whose *Ordeal of the Union* frequently reflected keen understanding of speechmaking as an historical force, here seems to give less emphasis to the leaders' ability to persuade. But the seeming omission is not a grievous one, since he often appears to use "eloquence" as a synonym only for delivery, and treat of invention, disposition, and style as "power of pen."

The last two lectures spell out the dismal failure of Jefferson Davis in meeting his problem of statesmanship, that of creating a new nation, and the heroic success of Abraham Lincoln in meeting his, that of preserving an old one.

The lecture on Davis clearly marks the basic dilemmas of the South: the practical conflict between States Rights and the drastic measures necessary for survival, and the moral conflict between the Confederacy's noble ideas of liberty and its maintenance of the institution of slavery. But beyond these, Nevins probes to the heart of failure and finds it in Davis' want of passion, his inability to convert its drive in the molding of public opinion. "He had a reputation for eloquence," says Nevins, "but it was an eloquence cold, chiselled, and intellectual."

"Why was it that the winged words always came from the other side of the Potomac?" The answer to the question is not an uncomplicated one, but it centers upon Lincoln's "supreme dexterity in managing both his associates and the mass opinion of the country." In speeches, letters, and personal negotiations, Nevins makes clear, Lincoln, the supreme realist, held onto his passion. Though this same passion may have been almost imperceptible among his countrymen, "by his example and his simple eloquence" Lincoln could make it flame. In this best sense, he was a statesman of heroic mold.

Quintilian would have approved the sound moral base in Nevins' concept of political leadership, and applauded the excellent lectures in which it is set forth. Contemporary rhetoricians should do no less.

J. Jeffery Auer,
University of Virginia

HORACE GREELEY: NINETEENTH-CENTURY CRUSADER. By Glyndon G. Van Deusen. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953; pp. 445. $5.00.

Here, at last, is a biography worthy of the fabulous Horace Greeley, "Old White Coat," greatest editor of his age and without a doubt the most colorful and influential of all mid-nineteenth-century crusaders. Since at various times Greeley was awash most of the main currents—as well as many of the eddies—of American thought, this Beveridge prize-winning book is a social, political, and intellectual history of the period from 1811 to 1872. Based largely upon original sources, many heretofore unpublished, *Horace Greeley* is a strikingly unstereotyped account of this venturesome era.

Contemporary observers found it hard to ignore Horace Greeley. "Hurrah for the old white hat that covers a mighty head!" shouted exuberant Greeleyites during his campaign for the presidency in 1872. Eccentric in dress, habit, and political outlook, the "Farmer-Editor of Chappaqua" circulated noisily amid a diverse, but spectacular circle of associates: Phineas T. Barnum, Margaret Fuller, Thurlow Weed, George Ripley, Susan B. Anthony, Albert Brisbane, Henry Ward Beecher, William Cullen Bryant, and William H. Seward—to name a few. His "round, pale face," flowing white hair, and chin-whiskers, oversized coat and hat, and "noble air of candor" made him easy to identify even in a company of unusual personalities. So shambling was his gait that he was reputed to walk down both sides of the street at once.

Opponents claimed that Greeley's editorials revealed opinions correspondingly unsteady. According to Republican editor Samuel Bowles, he was "by turns sagacious and childish." Though he hired Karl Marx as a foreign correspondent and publicized Fourier's utopian socialism, he nonetheless regularly supported conservative candidates at the polls. An advocate of Sylvester P. Graham's dietary reform and a champion of temperance in the use of alcohol, he displayed a studied intemperance in the use of words. An acrimonious opponent of slaveholders, he invited the abuse of former friends by signing Jeff Davis' bail bond. He was, says Mr. Van Deusen, "always striving to bring into the nation's life a synthesis between capital and labor, wealth and poverty, the material and the ideal." In an astute observation, Andrew Johnson claimed that Greeley ran "to goodness of heart so much as to produce an infirmity of mind." Though full of romantic optimism, he was careful not to pursue his transcendental enthusiasms to the point where they would hurt the *Tribune's* circulation. Such ideological schizophrenia was perhaps characteristic of those mid-century Americans who kept their eyes on a glorious future while struggling with the realistic clay of an undeveloped continent.

The enigmatic Greeley did not confine his persuasive activities to a musty editorial cell. His "thin, almost feminine voice, with its tendency to piercing sharpness in argument," was raised in many a gas-illuminated gathering. As early as 1852, the crusading editor claimed to be lecturing "a full third of the time." Greeley the lecturer receives scant attention from historian Van Deusen—an oversight which should prompt a lively graduate thesis. In spite of this omission, however, Mr. Van Deusen has provided rhetorical scholars with a brilliant account of the environment in which grandiloquent oratory flourished.

ROBERT GRAY GUNDERSON
Oberlin College

COUNSEL FOR THE DAMNED. By Lowell S. Hawley and Ralph Bushnell Potts. New York: The J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953. pp. 320. $3.75.

The subject of this fast-paced biography is George Francis Vanderveer, Iowa born, Stanford and Columbia Law School educated, and later to become "the most controversial legal figure of the Pacific Northwest during its most dramatic era."

It was the era of the bid for power of the I. W. W. and the abortive general strike of 1919, of the Everett and Centralia killings, of the trials of Tom Tracy and "Big Bill" Haywood and scores of others on charges ranging from vagrancy and rumrunning to murder and wartime sabotage. As defense counsel at these trials, Vanderveer rose to a fame rivaling even that of Darrow. He "saved dozens from the hangman's noose . . . defended men intent on revolution" with a lust for battle for the underdog that "drove him from the inner circle of respectability to the fringe of Skid Road [*sic*] . . . until he became a brawling, blasphemous but ever brilliant lawyer stalking through the courtrooms of the nation and hammering out legal victories wherein the decisions were to become the precedents of a later day and age."

That Vanderveer had extraordinary talent stands out through all these pages. That he used that talent unstintingly in defense of the poor and downtrodden also is without challenge. Yet, it is difficult to admire a man so prevailingly callous and calculating, so corrodingly cynical and profane as he is here made out to be. Always his goal was victory at whatever cost. When he accepted a case, he saturated himself in it until he became indubitably persuaded that his client was in the right. Thus convinced, he employed every dodge and gambit in the arsenal; if one's cause is just, why raise silly moral questions as to method? And in particular, like Darrow, he held that species of philosophy of social determinism always so convenient to the attorney for the defense!

The ethical question is resolved, perhaps, in his urge "always to seek the path of greatest resistance, to throw his weight upon the short side of the uneven struggle." He revelled in frequent brawls on Skid Row, often emerging

with blackened eye and other proud marks of sanguinary encounter. Once the gage of battle was down, his fighting creed required that no quarter be asked or given. So it was also in the forum. The Wobbly, the bindlestiff, the rejected of men, had got the dirty end in life's lottery. In any brush with the Law, the scales were overwhelmingly weighted against him. Who was to defend the defenseless? Who was to question *any* means that would help to redress the balance? So runs the rationalization.

The book's descriptions are vivid, its analyses of economic and social forces sharp and compelling. Its trial scenes are colorful and dramatic. It should be of special interest to those who seek knowledge of the ways, devious and otherwise, of successful courtroom advocacy and maneuver.

JAMES GORDON EMERSON,
Stanford University

PERPETUAL WAR FOR PERPETUAL PEACE. Edited by Harry Elmer Barnes. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1953; pp. 679. $6.00.

The editor states in his Preface that this book was originally conceived as an answer to Basil Rauch's *Roosevelt from Munich to Pearl Harbor* (which was written as an answer to Charles A. Beard's *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War, 1941*). Barnes adds, however, that the contributors "questioned the logic and wisdom of directing the fire of a piece of heavy artillery against a mouse. . . . They suggested, instead, a comprehensive review of the interventionist foreign policy since 1937 which would constitute an effective and enduring answer to the whitewashing and blackout contingents as a group, present and future." The book is dedicated to the memory of Charles A. Beard. And so the debate continues.

The contributors to this "piece of heavy artillery" include Harry Elmer Barnes, Charles Callan Tansill, Frederic R. Sanborn, William L. Neumann, George Morgenstern, Percy L. Greaves, Jr., William Henry Chamberlin, and George A. Lundberg. These gentlemen at another time would have been called America Firsters and Isolationists, but now they choose to be referred to as revisionists.

In an opening essay, entitled "Revisionism and the Historical Blackout," the editor argues that a conspiracy exists to prevent the revisionists from getting a fair hearing. Accused of attempting to ignore or obscure their writings are the foundations with funds to subsidize study, the major publishers, the book review editors, the government officials, the book stores, and last but not least the "hatchet men" or "court historians," those who have come under the pernicious influence of Roosevelt. Some readers may conclude that the authors are suffering from a persecution complex.

The book may be summarized by the following propositions:

1. Roosevelt "must bear a portion of the responsibility" for Munich.

2. Roosevelt, motivated by a desire for personal aggrandizement, maneuvered and "gradually edged", the United States into war.

3. When unable to provoke Germany into "shooting first," Roosevelt and his advisers then worked feverishly to dupe Japan into "shooting first."

4. Roosevelt and his advisers, eager to involve the United States in the war, ignored and thwarted the proposals of Germany and Japan for peaceful settlements.

5. The diplomats of Germany and Japan were sincere and trustworthy in their proposals, while Roosevelt, Hull, Stimson, and Marshall were untrustworthy. For example, George A. Lundberg says, "For bland fraudulence on the part of high officials there is perhaps nothing comparable to it in our history." (p. 603.)

6. The United States should have pursued its "traditional policy of continentalism," remaining aloof from involvement in the affairs of Europe and Asia.

These writers have taken great pains to demonstrate through extensive footnoting that they have pored over the various committee reports and investigations, memoirs, and documents of the period. In building their case, they have meticulously cited supporting details. Busy with sleuthing and reporting they have neglected to evaluate their facts and arguments in light of the overall policies and strategies of Germany, Italy, and Japan. There can be little doubt that the United States during the Roosevelt administration could have avoided, for a time at least, conflict with the Axis nations at the price of recognizing Japanese and German aggression in Asia and Europe. Many Americans consider this price too high.

WALDO W. BRADEN,
Louisiana State University

A FAITH TO PROCLAIM. By James S. Stewart. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953; pp. 160. $2.50.

Dr. James S. Stewart is Professor of New

Testament in the University of Edinburgh and Chaplain to the Queen of Scotland. He is also one of the most distinguished preachers in his native land. American ministers have come to know and admire him through his two books of sermons, *The Gates of New Life* (1937), *The Strong Name* (1940), and his Warrack Lectures on preaching, *Heralds of God* (1946).

A Faith to Proclaim represents the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching at Yale University for 1952. In his earlier book, *Heralds of God*, Dr. Stewart focused attention on *how* to preach. In *A Faith to Proclaim*, he concentrates on *what* to preach. Actually, however, by demonstrating outstanding skill in the selection, organization, illustration, and expression of ideas, Dr. Stewart communicates both the construction and the content of effective preaching.

In five excellent chapters, Stewart says that a preacher is to declare "the mighty acts in which God has visited and redeemed his people." He is to proclaim the Incarnation, Forgiveness, the Cross, the Resurrection and Christ. The heart of the preacher's task is evangelism—the proclamation of a spiritual resurrection to a bewildered world.

Taking his cue from Apostolic preaching, the author sees the essence of the Christian Faith in the proclamation of historic, unique, eschatological events: in Jesus, prophecy was fulfilled; in Jesus, God came into human life to redeem it; in Jesus' words and deeds, life, death, and resurrection, the new age had arrived; in Jesus, the living God confronts men in judgment and mercy offering them salvation.

Proclaiming the Incarnation means presenting the facts about Christ, incarnate, crucified, risen, as God's redemptive activity toward men. Proclaiming forgiveness means demonstrating that forgiveness is necessary, possible, and right. Proclaiming the Cross means presenting the factors which produced it: the coalition of historic forces, the will of Christ, and the predestination of God. Proclaiming the Resurrection means declaring that it provides God's vindication of rightness, God's power for man's weakness, unseen companionship with the Risen Christ, fellowship of believers in the church, and the defeat of death. Proclaiming Christ means heralding a vital relationship with Him as the church's greatest need and hope for effective evangelism.

A Faith to Proclaim is a little book in size but a big book in substance!

EDMUND H. LINN,
Andover Newton Theological School

BEYOND CRITICISM. By Karl Shapiro. Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 1953: pp. 73. $3.00.

This is a publication of Karl Shapiro's lectures on poetry at the University of Nebraska under the terms of the Montgomery Lectureship on Contemporary Civilization. This book should have a wide reading: the opinions held by the editor of *Poetry* magazine should be expected to affect considerably the kind of poetry which will be permitted an audience in our day.

Mr. Shapiro emphasizes as context of and occasion for his opinions his sense of the contemporary literary scene as composed of many "belligerent factions," many or most of them making false or extravagant claims for the nature and value of both poets and poems. Mr. Shapiro views his own role as that of a "peacemaker," and a good-hearted reading of this book should serve even the most partisan advocate of one or the other current dogmas as a properly ironic corrective for his own enthusiasm.

This should be the case even when the reader does not agree with all of Mr. Shapiro's comments on the contemporary scene. For example, I do not really believe with Mr. Shapiro that "criticism is a Greek chorus which speaks for an audience it has killed." But it is an admirably witty sentence, and the most athletic exegete should appreciate the partial validity of Mr. Shapiro's opinion that works ought to be read "with good subjective gusto." The book is filled with pins like this for modern critical balloons that have almost flown out of sight.

For purposes of simplification, Mr. Shapiro divides the belligerent bands he sees about him into two groups: "Poets of Myth" ("who believe in the transcendental value of art") and "Poets of History" ("who believe in the propagandistic value of art"). In general, both poetry and criticism are said to go wrong as they accept one or the other of these doctrines.

Mr. Shapiro's work as a whole may be seen as the attempt to provide still another view of poetry. His is not an entirely lucid exposition. In part his essays suffer from their original presentation as lectures. Repetition in slightly different form, from lecture to lecture, of poetry's characteristics creates a considerable ambiguity. Also Mr. Shapiro often seems to use terms like "knowledge," "proof," "innocent," and "sincere" for their honorific rather than their descriptive value. Furthermore, Mr. Shapiro's decision to avoid personal reference

in order to further his peacemaker's role often makes it hard, if not impossible, to know just whom or what he is talking about. I doubt that it was a wise tactic to avoid specific examples. Far from being reassured, most of the combatants will surely suspect that Mr. Shapiro has defined his peace-making operation as a simple decision to fire on everybody else.

Yet, despite certain obscurities in reference, there ultimately emerges from these essays a view of poetry which seems to this reviewer a curious admixture of hard sense and dewy-eyed romanticism. Sensibly, Mr. Shapiro stresses the inevitable personal limitations of a poet's vision of the world; he sees a poem as a highly personal expression of a highly personal impression, valuable because someone values it. Romantically, Mr. Shapiro insists on the "innocence" and "sincerity" of the poet, maintains that the true poet "is unconscious of history and never lives in the future or the past"—all of which suggests the poem as a work of the sensitive savage.

Such a view accounts for Mr. Shapiro's general distress with Symbolist and Metaphysical poetry, his dislike of thinking of "levels" of meaning in a poem, his love of the "sound" of words as somehow inherently meaningful, his dissatisfaction with rigorous criticism, etc.

That Mr. Shapiro is right to defend a simple, unpretentious, personal poetry none of us can doubt. That he defends this poetry by certain dogmatic exclusions of his own, we have a right to fear.

DON GEIGER,
University of California at Berkeley

THE TRIUMPH OF THE ALPHABET. By Alfred C. Moorhouse. New York: Henry Schuman, 1953; pp. 223. $3.50.

Subtitled *A History of Writing*, this book covers the ground from the archeological evidence of the earliest writing, through the pre-alphabetic scripts and their decipherment, to the use of writing in the modern world and the problem of illiteracy. It reports the latest archeological discoveries and the fascinating detective work by which ancient scripts have been deciphered. It is profusely illustrated with drawings and diagrams and an eight-page inset of photographs on glossy paper. It traces the Semitic alphabet through its development in the Greek and Roman alphabets. Not much attention is given to the Cyrillic, Arabic, or Indian forms, though there are brief references to Cherokee, Cree, and Japanese syllabaries, and a considerable analysis of Chinese writing.

Although alphabets have, in their origin, a phonetic base, the author has failed to acquire the thorough knowledge of phonetics which he needs for the interpretation. His description of the sounds represented by the Hebrew alphabet (pp. 97-98) ranges from the self contradictory to the tautological. Although he describes classical Greek *chi* and *phi* as aspirated stops, he apparently regards *theta* (p. 131) as the spirant of English *thin*. He speaks (p. 170) of the Old English *thorn* and *eth* as if they represented the sounds of Modern English *thin* and *the*, although these sounds did not become phonemically distinct till the late Middle English period. When the reader discovers that the only strictly linguistic books in the author's bibliography are Bloomfield's *Language*, Bodmer's *The Loom of Language*, and Pedersen's *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, he begins to understand the reason for the author's difficulties. To put Bodmer on the same plane as Bloomfield and Pedersen, and to use Bloomfield only "for the connection between writing and speech," is to guarantee confusion.

C. K. THOMAS,
Cornell University

ONEIDA VERB MORPHOLOGY. By Floyd G. Lounsbury. Yale University Publications in Anthropology 48. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953. pp. 111. $1.50.

The materials for this study were collected at Oneida, Wisconsin, in 1939-1940, as part of a project sponsored by the University of Wisconsin and carried out under the Works Progress Administration. Oneida is one of the six still spoken Northern Iroquoian languages, the others being Mohawk, Onondaga, Cayuga, Seneca, and Tuscarora. These languages are polysynthetic, of the type known as incorporating.

This study attempts an analysis of the morphology of the verb in Oneida by the method of morpheme alternants (i.e., dividing the forms of actual utterances into minimal segments, or sequences of phonemes, to which it is possible to assign meanings). It discusses pre-pronominal prefixes, pronominal prefixes, the verb base, and inflectional suffixes. The introduction contains a short discussion of the method of descriptive morphology (twelve pages). An analysis of a text as written down by an Oneida Indian writer of the project concludes the study.

The phonology of Oneida is detailed in a Table showing the phonemes, allophones, and allophonic environments. Oneida possesses six

vowel phonemes, two of which are normally nasalized. These phonemes are /a, e, i, o, ã, ũ/. In final utterance positions these vowels undergo some unvoicing, except when the vowel is long. The consonants of this language are represented by the phonemic symbols /j, w, l, n, s, dʒ, t, k, ʔ, h/. The allophones show the presence of [ɸ], [f], [z], [ʃ], [tʃ], [d], [g], and [ɦ]. There are no labials in Oneida.

The sample text is written in the phonemic orthography adopted by the project and used in this study. A transcription showing allophonic variants would have given the reader a clearer sound picture of the language. This however was not the major purpose of the author.

Much more about Oneida will need doing before this language is really understood. This study is carefully developed and amply illustrated. It is another fine contribution to the developing understanding of the American Indians, their languages, and cultures.

ARTHUR J. BRONSTEIN,
Queens College

WORDS AND SOUNDS IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH. By John Orr. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953; pp. viii+279, 2 maps. $4.25.

Professor Orr of the University of Edinburgh has collected in this volume two dozen of his linguistic studies (nine are written in French) spanning the period 1933-1953. The studies vary greatly in length and content—from remarks on *to prune* and *to preen,* or the analysis of an English sentence overheard at a tea party, to richly documented articles like "Les Anglicismes du vocabulaire sportif" or *"Autre, outre . . . et foutre"*—but they have certain features in common, as the author himself points out in a brief preface: "they are as far removed from the pseudo-science of the Neo-Grammarians as from the pseudo-mathematics of the Structuralists and 'Linguisticians.'" More important, they do not lose sight of the close interaction of sound and sense; and "they attempt to view language as an essentially human activity, complex, purposeful and gratuitous, fumbling and ingenious, practical and playful, serious and whimsical." Like Jules Gilliéron, the pioneer in linguistic geography, to whose memory the collection is dedicated, Professor Orr has a profound insight into the complexities of living speech. In addition he knows how to present his findings in terms readily intelligible to non-specialists, as in "Linguistic Geography as a Corrective to Etymology" and "On Homonymics." Though his main field is French, he has much to say of interest to English specialists, as these titles will indicate: "English and French—A Comparison," "On Some Sound Values in English," the lead article "The Flea and the Fly" (the verb *to flee,* in decline because of its homonomy with *flea,* discussed in its relation *to fly,* etc.); and especially the Taylorian lecture (Oxford, 1948) entitled "The Impact of French upon English."

WAYNE CONNER,
Washington University

FLAMING MINISTER: A STUDY OF OTHELLO AS TRAGEDY OF LOVE AND HATE. By G. R. Elliott. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1953; pp. xxxvi+245. $4.50.

MACBETH. Edited by Kenneth Muir. (Eighth edition, revised). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953; pp. lxxiv+200. $2.75.

Professor Elliott's *Flaming Minister* is a companion volume to his *Scourge and Minister: A Study of Hamlet as Tragedy of Revengefulness and Justice* of 1951. That book should first be read, at least its preface and introduction, before embarking upon the *Othello* study. Each follows an exact plan of line-by-line analysis, although constantly the interpreter looks both backward and forward to show the tightly-woven pattern of word and symbol, of character and incident; each alleges to be purely objective; each represents an attempt to visualize and to hear an actual production. In the preface to *Scourge and Minister,* the author wrote: "If my interpretation irritates you, so much the better. Return to your own *Hamlet* with renewed ardor of scrutiny." Well, we are all human, even a die-hard "humanist" like Professor Elliott, and in a footnote to the present preface, he shows irritation at a reviewer who accused him "of reading into Hamlet motives which in fact are read into him . . . by Shakespeare himself." Such a remark, and the general tenor of the preface and introduction to *Flaming Minister,* are likely to make a reviewer wary, and I early made a note: "as cavalier in his assumption of the role of perfect judge and in his changing of words and realignment of lines (in order to restore what Shakespeare wrote) as he is casual, to put it politely, in his general knowledge of drama and literature." But soon I forebore quibbling. I became absorbed, fascinated, gripped. A play which I have never admired, which has always seemed

more melodrama than tragedy, which has seemed lacking in real motivation and depth of character (always granting occasional fine lines), began to move me greatly, to become a thing of excessive and terrifying power and beauty. No production of the play in the theatre has ever so held me. Professor Elliott hopes both books may be used by actors. I should like, the proper company found, to see his interpretation (let us not boggle at whether it is Shakespeare's) attempted. *All* the characters spring to life! Othello not a spouting-machine but a very complex figure who brings about his *own* downfall; Desdemona not a stupid blonde lost among things she doesn't understand but a woman greatly in love, only too proud in her self-will to realize the "visage" she sees in Othello's "mind" is not the real one; Iago "a foolish fellow and small" whose motivation is hatred of Desdemona's essential goodness; the other characters, especially Cassio, Roderigo, Emilia, and Bianca, all roundly developed. The book is a *must* for all scholars, teachers, directors, actors.

Kenneth Muir's edition of *Macbeth* was the first published (1951) of the revised Arden Edition of Shakespeare. The original (1912) was edited by Henry Cuningham. Forty years of scholarship have produced so much new material that Mr. Muir actually includes only some of Cuningham's notes, he being quoted merely as a previous commentator. A long new introduction, voluminous new notes, several appendices, and a revised text form Mr. Muir's contribution, now revised with corrections, "various alterations," and a new appendix. The edition is most satisfying: the notes are desirably complete; the relevant Holinshed material forms the first appendix; the introduction, especially the last section, constitutes a valuable and provocative separate *Macbeth* essay. Mr. Muir has his own ideas about the play. He discards, for instance, the pet critical interpretation of Macbeth as one in whom a soldier struggles with a poet: "he is merely," he writes, "part of a great poem." If the editor has any faults, they are this tendency to stress poem rather than play, and his membership in the "new school" of critics who treat Shakespeare's characters (as he chides Professor Charlton for claiming) "as plastic symbols in an arabesque of esoteric imagery" or as "rhythmic ripples intoned in a chromatic ritual." And since he *is* so fond of recurrent imagery, why did he fail to mention Allardyce Nicoll's simple, sound, and suggestive reference to the completely interpenetrating complex of blood-death-sleep images?

E. J. West,
University of Colorado

CURTAIN TIME. By Lloyd Morris. New York: Random House, 1953; pp. xvi+380. $5.00.

Since mid-century, when biographers, literary critics, and historians began examining our social, economic, cultural, and moral progress (or retrogression), the wonder has been who would reminisce first about the theatre. Fittingly enough, it turns out to be an eminently qualified New Yorker who has beaten the rest of us to the bookshelf. His long, carefully and lovingly written chronicle is a joy to read.

Using as his focal point the actor, Morris has written a comprehensive summary of the American theatre from 1820 to the present, a history characterized by wide reading and succinct condensation. The author expresses himself in a style that is invariably lucid and pleasant, and more than occasionally sharp in observation and happy in analysis. In addition to the writings of the Messrs. Odell, Quinn, Carson, MacMinn, and Gagey, Morris has drawn abundantly from a host of familiar memoirs, journals, and biographies, chosen both wisely and well. Although he furnishes neither footnotes nor a bibliography, his volume represents a meticulous, even a conservative, piece of recreation.

In such a long and "popular" presentation, the errors of fact or judgment are surprisingly few. Those of trivial notice include the transposition of Mordecai Manuel in Noah's name; the spelling of J. H. Stoddart as *Stoddardt;* and possibly a few mistakes concerning Julia Marlowe (owing, doubtless, to the later publication of her own story). Questionable are Morris's reference to the 1928-29 season as "the peak of production," instead of the previous one; his belief that Elmer Rice "achieved his greatest artistic success with *Dream Girl*"; and his censure of Edwin Booth for having played "the murder of Desdemona not as a deed of frenzy but as a solemn sacrifice." If Booth's interpretation was not valid, then Kean was wrong, too, histrionically, and William Winter, for one, critically.

But this is captious. The excellences of the book are manifold: the wide margins on either side of the spine for easier reading and notation; the more than 25 illustrations, many of them seldom seen, a few unknown or forgotten; the brief, yet palpable revivification of Cooke, Forrest, and Cushman, among others;

the panoramic rather than sectional portrait of the profession; and, always pertinently enlightening, the background of change, of ebb and flow, in the geographical, technological, financial, and social development of the United States as it affected the temples and the disciples of Thespis.

One is by space too cabin'd, cribb'd, confined to illustrate fully our thanks to the author for many fresh (though not necessarily unique) points of view, such as the fallacy that our early national legislators "required entertainment when, actually, they furnished it"—and free of charge; and that with the showboat "one of the most remarkable cultural transfers in history was accomplished so quietly that later historians failed to record it." See, however, Professor Philip Graham's *Showboats* (1951).

Morris may confound some of us by his estimate of Mrs. John Hoey, whom we had visualized as primarily a clothes-horse, as "*the* leading lady of the New York stage" from 1854-64; by the reminder of Burton's magnificent scenery and costumes and "scholarly care for accuracy of detail" in his Shakespearean productions; by his revelation of the hard-headed William A. Brady, one-time pugilistic manager, as the backer of attempts to offer the public "plays of a better type"; and by his seemingly incredible statement that Edwin Booth was perhaps the first to play *Hamlet* on a bare stage in modern dress.

As Joxer might say, "Ahhh, it's a *da-a-arlin'* book!"

ALBERT E. JOHNSON,
University of Texas

PLAYS AS LITERATURE FOR AN AUDIENCE. By George F. Reynolds. Boulder, Colorado: The University of Colorado Press, 1953; pp. 51. $1.50.

This meaty little book is a reworking of some lectures on the same subject given by the author at Stratford-upon-Avon for the University of Birmingham. The brevity of the volume should not be misleading. Professor Reynolds has packed into these laden pages many answers to a problem which has bothered both speech and drama students for a good long time. He is concerned to show that "the most important role in any play is that played by the audience—the cues to which it responds and the response it makes."

The book is divided into three sections: "Literature for an Audience," "What is an Audience?," and "The Role of an Audience." In the first section the author illustrates the thesis that, regardless of its form, there are really but two types of literature, each with its own appropriate language: one which is written to be heard by an audience, and the other written to be read by an individual sitting alone. In his second section, Reynolds defines a "real audience" as one fused by the performance into a group in which "its members forget their snobbishness—social, artistic, literary." In his final section, Reynolds develops the notion that the role of the audience is determined by the material offered it, material which in any case must be competent to hold the attention and mold the audience.

In view of its governing thesis, that the play and the public address are the only types of literature available for audiences today, this study should be of interest to students of speechmaking as well as of drama.

REGINALD V. HOLLAND,
North Texas State College

SCENERY DESIGN FOR THE AMATEUR STAGE. By Willard J. Friederich and John H. Frazer. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950; pp. 264. $3.75.

The authors of this text have set out to produce a book which will fill the gap which exists in the area of scene design for the amateur stage. They have done exactly that. They do not claim that their book is a treatise on scenery construction; it is not. Neither is it a source book on period design. While it is especially intended for the use of those cursed with a bad stage, it says much that may be applied to the best of stages, professional or amateur.

One might argue about the aesthetics of presenting the design problem in terms of the traditional divisions of realism, naturalism, romanticism, classicism, symbolism and expressionism, especially when the given definitions of these slippery terms are sketchy. As a treatise on theatrical form, this section leaves a lot to be desired. One cannot argue, however, with the concrete examples which accompany these abstract ideas. Even if they do not define the terms above, they at least give the novice designer a list of good ways to approach a script. The authors seem to feel—and rightly so—that it is more important that the beginner learn to design well than it is that he be able to categorize his work.

When the authors direct themselves to the demands of the various parts of the production organization, they are almost always exhaustive. An exception is a scattered discussion of the

relationship between lighting and scenery. As a whole, however, this section is one of the best of its kind in print.

While the experienced designer will find most of the book stimulating, if not new, the section on elements and principles of design may seem tedious. The beginner may find it exhaustive and even confusing because of the inevitable overlapping of terms. This material seems good as a basis for classroom discussion where the terms may be thrashed out; not for private study.

The more technical sections of the book take up sketching and working drawings. They manage to strike a happy medium between practical expression of proposed ideas on paper and artistic rendering. Perhaps a little more emphasis on the model as a device for representing the designer's ideas would be appropriate.

The final section of this text is given to a discussion of various particular problems and special types of scenery. These tend to overlap into the realm of scenery construction and to be rather thin in that respect. It is necessary, however, that the designer be aware of these techniques and this may be the best way to do the job.

A very useful glossary, bibliography and directory of supply houses is appended to the book. All in all, this text does an excellent job of what it sets out to do. It should find application in the educational theatre wherever an attempt is made to make artists out of technicians.

WILLARD BELLMAN,
Washington University

FILM FORM. By Sergei Eisenstein. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1953; pp. 279. $4.50.

As an aid in the understanding of Eisenstein's theoretical writing on film art, the translation of these twelve lengthy essays can be read with much profit. The translator, Jay Leyda, succeeds admirably if not easily in fulfilling the intended purpose: to show certain key-points in the development of Eisenstein's film theory, and in particular of his analysis of the sound-film medium.

The essays reveal a sincere effort to clarify the aesthetic principles which guided Eisenstein in the making of film. Although each essay has its own unity, the group is wanting in this regard. In spite of his warning against an approach to film problems with the preconceived concept of scholastic methods, Eisenstein is at his best and clearest when he uses the scholastic method of analysis. His distinction of terms, the basis of all clear thinking, is an example in point. Through a careful consideration of these distinctions this reader found the present essays most helpful in his struggle through the film's great labyrinth of theorizing.

Using shot as the basis whose "factual immutability is rooted in nature," Eisenstein moves into a discussion of montage. This film technique takes on a new interest when discussed by its master in relation to the shot, which he says is more resistant than granite. Its factual immutability is rooted in its nature. The minimum distortable fragment of nature is the shot. Ingenuity in its combination is montage. In these the author believed he had found the materialistic element in the theatre.

Montage, however, became too emphatically exact. As the *mise-en-scene* is the interrelation of people in action, so the *mise-en-cadre* is the pictorial composition of mutually dependent *cadres*, shots, in a montage sequence. Story was lost. The hero now was the "mass"; the conception of collectivity was to be pictured. This was in 1924. Story has since returned, he tells us, to its proper place in Russian film thinking. Thus far, he asserts, the Russians have mastered the elements of film diction, the technique of the frame, the montage. The value of profound ties with the tradition of methodology of literature, film language, as an expression of film thinking was born.

Eisenstein looks disdainfully on European methods of emotional transition in the theatre. He solves the difficulty of this method by means of the cut. Japan, he regrets, imitates American and European entries in the international commercial film race.

In the essay, "A Dialectic Approach to Film Form," the author tells us that man sees things sometimes in aspects contrary to their nature. The result is conflict, which Eisenstein calls dynamism. The spatial form of dynamism he calls expression; the phases of its tension, rhythm. Montage implies throwing aside the ballast of exactitude, the concept that irregularity is the basis of all art, and that the unexpected, surprise, and astonishment are an essential part and characteristic of beauty. The art of cinematography, he maintains, lies in making every fragment of a film an organic whole.

The book shows the strength and activeness of Eisenstein's mind. In the area of film, he is indeed a discoverer of the unknown. The early essays will be for the lover of the film art a source of real enjoyment, for they seem less hampered by his mission of Moscow tenden-

cies. Sergei Eisenstein's search for true art principles is indeed stimulating; it is vital and important and certainly an appreciable contribution to the art of cinematography. *Film Form* is a must on the book shelves of the serious student of cinematography. The handicap which the reader must be able to overcome is the technical and philosophical knowledge required for a full appreciation of the values that lie buried in these twelve essays. The author's sincere search for true aesthetic principles is heart-warming to all lovers of beauty. The lashings which Eisenstein gives to mediocrities in the realm of motion pictures, including the new Soviet film of his day, will satisfy the most demanding perfectionist.

The translation no doubt was a monumental task. Although easy to read, the content of the essays is not easy to comprehend. The sandwiched-in Soviet propaganda has much the flavor, but little of the nourishment, of stale bread. Although this element detracts from the author's objective thinking, it is not of sufficient proportion or kind as to be too disturbing to the student of art and culture.

CHARLES S. COSTELLO,
Marycrest College

TEEN THEATRE: A GUIDE TO PLAY PRODUCTION. By Edwin and Natalie Gross. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1953; pp. 245. $3.25.

The best remedy this reviewer can recommend for sleepless nights and nerve-racking days over student productions is a copy of *Teen Theatre*. In its seventy-page guide to play production, it concisely and clearly analyzes the duties of each phase of production.

In the Gross pattern of organization, the director is "the captain and responsible for the overall show, but the surest way to achieve a smooth performance is to assign responsibility." Employing this basic principle, *Teen Theatre* lists duties, analyzes and solves inevitable amateur problems, and gives suggestions in each of its eleven divisions from director to sound-effects man. Edwin and Natalie Gross meet problems and responsibilities with sound practical solutions for the budget-minded amateur group. For the director who is having a first try, *Teen Theatre* solves his dilemma of where to begin, what to do next. The systematic approach from tryouts to opening night assures interest and cooperation from everyone playing a part in the production.

For ease of reading and better assimilation of this vital material, a beginner can refer to the Glossary of Theatre Terms when in doubt. In addition to the analysis, Edwin and Natalie Gross include six royalty-free one-act plays for teen-age actors.

This is a book for beginners, whether student, club president, inexperienced teacher, or community committeeman. However, a twenty-year man who can produce a play in his sleep might profitably check for weak points by reading *Teen Theatre* objectively and examining his degree of success.

HARRY R. MCCLAIN,
Webster College and
St. Louis University

TELEVISION IN SCHOOL, COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY. By Jennie Waugh Callahan. New York: The McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1953; pp. xvi+389. $4.75.

In her acknowledgments, Mrs. Callahan mentions that she travelled some 10,000 miles in her *first* trip in 1951 compiling material for her manuscript. Surely no one will doubt it. She has covered the land thoroughly in her quest for educational television activities and has found them flourishing. Her interests are concerned with television in the elementary grades, junior and senior high schools, institutions of higher learning, and community groups. Any one of these might well have been an exclusive interest.

The author has organized her material in a highly satisfactory manner. She begins by discussing the establishment of an educational television station, continues by examining programs for such a station, and concludes by submitting some ten scripts with production notes by those responsible. There is a glossary and an excellent bibliography. All of this is laudable and should prove helpful to anyone engaging, or planning to engage, in educational television of any type. Her avowed aims are to strengthen present television courses and to encourage curriculum committees to introduce new courses. I am sure she will succeed in the first and I hope she will in the second. I view this, the first text to devote itself exclusively to educational television, a distinct addition to my own course.

One would have wished, however, for greater objectivity on the author's part. At the recent S.A.A. Convention in New York, the radio-television director of a university on the west coast commented on his own endeavors in the field. He concluded by reading reviews by press critics, with one of them stating that his pro-

gram was the longest half-hour on television. I admired his frankness in including this review and wished for more of the same quality in this study. Realistically, health topics cannot always be made "entertaining," true science cannot always be "delightful competition to popular space fiction," and a "dozen visual aids" does not insure that "the process of learning will be a pleasure," or even that there will be any learning at all. Too much enthusiasm and too little appraisal raises a legitimate question in the reader's mind. We aren't quite sure what the author's standards are or from whence they were derived, and when she praises liberally not only programs but personnel and production "formulae" as well, we wonder for whom she is writing. After all, a text book is not a promotional piece. Perhaps I am prejudiced by the fact that on page 100 she states that the Northwestern Reviewing Stand is an excellent example of the television forum. The program has never been on television.

When one reads the book with this reservation in mind, however, there is nothing but satisfaction to be gained—and perhaps a little pride. Schools, colleges, and communities over the country are moving, and if this experimental movement is not all distinguished, it is at least deserving of our closest attention as educators. Mrs. Callahan has helped us focus that attention.

CHARLES F. HUNTER,
Northwestern University

PRODUCING AND DIRECTING FOR TELEVISION. By Charles Adams. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1953; pp. 282. $3.95.

While this book is described as "a complete guide to all phases of television written especially for the professional, the small station owner and the student," its greatest value lies in the material devoted primarily to the problems of producing and directing television programs. The attempt to be all things to all people tends to weaken the presentation. A sharper and more consistent focus upon production and directing would have resulted in a little better organization of the content and given the book a little more value for the student as well as the director.

The analysis of the television station facilities and personnel is very practical and has excellent guide posts for station organization as well as suggestions for practical working relationships between various departments. The material on station equipment is not treated from a technical point of view but handled in a limited and basic manner designed to provide the producer and director with a minimum working knowledge of his tools and equipment. The entire section on equipment could be improved by a closer integration with the actual theory and practice of producing the television program. The chapter on special effects is extremely useful and provides a lot of information not readily available in other books.

The chapters dealing with directing procedures for various types of programs are alone worth the price of the book. For those interested in station organization and management, the chapter on programs for the local station and the one on budget and cost control should prove very helpful.

This book has a great many values in the way of practical suggestions, specific techniques and procedures, and current network and station practices. It could be improved from the standpoint of overall organization by a sharper focus upon production and directing. The weaknesses in structure show up when the emphasis shifts to the broader applications of management and administration. These are of sufficient importance in themselves to require separate treatment.

All things considered, however, it is a practical and useful book, and one which contains a great deal of very pertinent information.

ARMAND L. HUNTER,
Michigan State College

TELEVISION ADVERTISING AND PRODUCTION HANDBOOK. Edited by Irving Settel and Norman Glenn. New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1953; pp. xv+480. $6.00.

Settel and Glenn have compiled in this book what they intend to be "a comprehensive and practical introduction to the advertising and production aspects of television." In the main the editors have achieved their purpose by providing a highly readable book that should be of value to advertising agencies, television stations, free lance writers, advertisers, and students.

Included in this interesting and fact-filled handbook are nineteen chapters by leading authorities in nearly every special field of the video industry. Unlike many books that rely on the ideas of a large group of specialists, this compilation has been achieved with a minimum of inconsistency and with very little repetition of essential details. There is some overlapping of information, to be sure; but,

for the most part, the editors have been successful in avoidance of duplication.

The authors admit in their preface that in so new and thriving a field as television a book tends rapidly to become out-of-date. Actually, much of their data probably was outmoded by the time they completed their compilation; but if this obvious limitation placed on all books prepared for the video field is overlooked, one may find much that is worthwhile in the *Handbook*. In its coverage of the rather broad field of advertising and production, the volume surveys such problems pertinent to television as those involved in the financing, organizing and operating of the station itself; in the writing, casting, staging and producing of programs, both live and film; in the handling of such varied matters as coverage, commercials, syndication, censorship and personnel.

Chris J. Witting undertook the most difficult chore in the book when he prepared his chapter on "The Financial Aspects of Television." Anyone who has been involved in the intricate job of getting a station on the air is aware of the dangers inherent in attempting to set up minimum cost figures for "typical" installations. So many local factors enter into any effort to place a station in operation that, from this writer's viewpoint at least, there is no such thing as a "typical" or "minimum" cost for a television operation. Nevertheless, Mr. Witting's figures can be of value if the reader recognizes the handicap that faces anyone who attempts to classify stations by population areas.

Although the chapters in this book are uniformly good, the chapter on "Censorship for TV" by Stockton Helffrich should be required reading for every person actively engaged in any phase of television work, for every person who plans a career in television, and for every person who expects to watch television intelligently. Mr. Helffrich's observations and suggestions concerning problems of censorship offer a most sensible and mature solution to the question of the regulation of video fare.

The editors include seven appendixes, the first five of which are alone worth the price of the book. The first appendix presents the most complete dictionary of television terms that this writer has seen to date in the field. Appendixes Two through Five include "The Television Code," "Procedures for the Construction and Operation of a TV Station," "How Television Works," and "Visual Aids for Television." Appendix Six is a short bibliography, and Appendix Seven includes short biographies of the co-authors.

EDWARD C. LAMBERT,
University of Missouri

RADIO AND TELEVISION ANNOUNCING. By Lyle D. Barnhart. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 283. $5.00.

Mr. Barnhart states in the introduction that "this is not a book *about* announcing; it is a book *in* announcing." This statement is borne out completely in the interesting and helpful approach to the teaching of a most difficult subject.

The author treats the subject of radio and television announcing from the viewpoint that it is a specialized form of the professional speech. The first chapters have to do with the general qualifications of the announcer and the demands that are made on him. There follow approximately fifty pages of helpful information concerning pronunciation, specialized terms and names often found in the reading of news. The discussion on pronunciation is based upon the common sense approach of acceptable usage. It might be wished that the I.P.A. had been used along with the diacritical method of marking pronunciation exercises.

The remaining 190 pages are devoted to drill materials on dramatic, musical and commercial continuity; and several types of television commercials. The drill materials are printed offset in pica typewriter type double spaced. The pages are perforated so that they may be easily removed for better handling at the microphone.

Radio and television announcing is not an easy subject to teach or to learn. Too many facets of this subject do not lend themselves to inclusion in a text. Mr. Barnhart has contributed many helpful suggestions and has compiled stimulating drill materials to assist the student and the teacher to a greater understanding of problems in radio and television announcing.

DONALD S. DIXON,
University of Kansas

SPEECH THERAPY: A BOOK OF READINGS. By Charles Van Riper. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. xiii+319. $3.95.

According to the Preface, this book has been written "to serve as a collection of supplementary readings for courses in speech correction." Among its purposes is that of making available many important contributions to be

found in journals and texts which are not available to many libraries; thus, articles to be found in the *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders* were not included unless they represented such a unique contribution that they could not be ignored. The selections were chosen to expose the students of the profession to "the literature which forms its common core." It was the editor's hope that the excerpts selected would "whet the student's desire to read more on the same topic."

The reading selections were organized into chapters as follows: the speech therapist and his cases, forty-two pages; stuttering, sixty-eight pages; articulation disorders, forty-three pages; disorders of voice, twenty-six pages; cleft palate speech, twenty-five pages; foreign dialect, eighteen pages; cerebral palsy, fifteen pages; aphasia, nineteen pages; and the profession of speech therapy, fifty-nine pages including seventeen pages on speech therapy in other countries. Purposely, the editor has included only one reading on hearing and none on delayed speech.

This reviewer shares the editor's feeling that a text is sorely needed which will bring together significant material which is ordinarily not easily accessible to the student or which is to be found in the publications of a great variety of professional journals and texts. The complexity is so great that even instructors are apt to ignore material because they do not have the time or energy with which to seek it out.

In reviewing such a book as this one, it should be remembered that no two people will agree on the abstracting of such a vast field of literature; the editor has his notions, the reviewer his, and other readers yet other sets. Nevertheless, many readers will be pleased and impressed by the sheer magnitude of the editor's abstracting. With studied care he has been able to cover vast amounts of material by this means.

We can review the selecting on the basis of certain criteria having to do with the ways in which the text might be used. With this point of view in mind we might ask several questions.

1. Will the text serve to whet the curiosity of the student to the extent that he will be encouraged to read more widely? Probably not. If many of the original sources of the materials are unavailable or scattered, then the average student, pressed as he frequently is with the need to pass courses rather than to get an education, will be teased by some of the fragments but the original sources will still remain beyond his easy reach.

2. Is the text suited to a particular level of professional training? In this reviewer's opinion it is not. The beginner will find a need for editorial comment as an introduction to many of the issues discussed in the excerpts. He will also find more material on the theories involved than on the nature of the disorders. For example, in the chapter on stuttering little mention is made of the sizable literature concerning the variations in the phenomenon. Without such a background it would seem that the discussions of etiology might serve only to confuse the beginning student. In the case of voice disorders, the readings are concerned mainly with "organic" bases for the deviations. There is little material on the "functional" bases.

The advanced student will certainly be stimulated by many of the readings. On the other hand, many of them will prove to be "old hat."

Having made some essentially negative comments, the reviewer must hasten to add that the book has served to challenge his own selection of the material which he has considered desirable for his students to read. It has shaken his particular brand of professional provincialism. It has added a number of excellent articles to the available bibliographic material of his courses. Other teachers will certainly find it a book to consider in their teaching. Surely it is a text which all professional workers will want to read.

D. C. Spriestersbach,
State University of Iowa

SPEECH AND HEARING THERAPY. By Ruth Beckey Irwin. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. 243. $3.50.

This book can serve well as a manual for the speech therapist from the time training is begun until professional experience over a period of years has provided ample demonstration of its practicality. Dr. Irwin writes with a real understanding of the problems that the speech correctionist faces in a public school system and has provided many useful suggestions. Her emphasis is on the work of the therapist, but, as she points out in the Preface, those interested in the welfare of the handicapped, school administrators, members of service organizations, parents, and classroom teachers can also profit by reading the text.

The topics covered include: a discussion of speech and hearing therapy in the public schools; many recommendations for organizing a public school program in speech and hearing therapy; a description of methods of case-finding;

a consideration of the clinical approach to the study of the individual and of the dynamics of the educative process; a thorough discussion of ways of planning instruction for speech therapy and for hearing therapy; a much needed consideration of in-service training for parents and teachers; and a citing of sources of service, of audio-visual aids, of sample forms, of tests, and of sample lesson-plans.

The organization of the text material seems logical and the approach to therapy thoroughly practical. Controversial points have been presented fairly. Problems and projects for further study have been included, with bibliographies, at the ends of the chapters. The sample lesson plans presented in the Appendix are as useful as such material can be, but illustrate once more the difficulty of attempting to write a script or evolve a formula for someone else to follow. Although the illustrative material may make the reader unduly aware of Ohio, it is well-chosen and clarifies the suggestions made.

Of particular importance is the chapter on training for teachers and parents. Public school speech therapists have recognized the need for such "in-service" adjuncts to their programs, but have been dependent on their own devices and ingenuity, for the most part, in planning and carrying out this phase of their work. They should find confirmation of their own thinking and suggestions for additional planning in Chapter IX.

A few typographical errors mar the text, but the format is good, the print is easily read, the pictures are clear, and the concepts are well worth studying, digesting, and applying. Speech therapists, in training and in the field, will welcome this text as an addition to their professional libraries.

CHARLOTTE G. WELLS,
University of Missouri

KEEP YOUR VOICE HEALTHY. By Friedrich S. Brodnitz. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. xiv+234. $3.50.

Keep Your Voice Healthy is the simple adjuration; it is not the self-help manual that the blurb suggests. Dr. Brodnitz, one of the few M.D.'s who is a member of the American Speech and Hearing Association, has a practice in laryngology concerned with professional users of the singing and speaking voice. This book is written as general background reading for such patients.

Dr. Brodnitz covers the vocal mechanism in an easy, clear chapter; he discusses colds in relation to voice; he talks generally about speech defects. He gives more credit to the chewing method than most of us would, and a few other concepts seem less concerned with the American than the German voice. But the main use of the book should be in helping patient attitudes. He has a clear, brief discussion on the effect of emotional problems in bringing on "cold" symptoms. He explains well why a patient cannot rely on self-diagnosis or self-therapy. And he recognizes the usual points of patient resistance: "Nothing is so hard to accept for the voice professional as the fact that an impairment of his voice has a purely functional basis." "The secret of normal function is not relaxation . . . but the use of the *right* muscles and the application of the *right* degree of muscle tonus." "The critical phase of the treatment comes . . . when the patient has to learn to accept permanently the free speech offered and demonstrated to him. . . ."

For these, and many other useful attitudes—here presented for the first time, so far as the reviewer knows, with the weight of an M.D. behind them—this book is worth owning, reading with a chuckle, and lending out a great deal.

PAUL C. BOOMSLITER,
New York State College for Teachers

CLINICIAN'S HANDBOOK FOR AUDITORY TRAINING. By J. C. Kelly. Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1953; pp. iv+155. $2.00.

The above handbook was prepared for the speech and hearing therapist and designed for auditory training of hard-of-hearing adults and children ten years and older. The objective of the handbook is to develop listening attention, speech sound discrimination and auditory memory span through progressively more difficult auditory training lessons.

A brief discussion of the listening act and adaptation to amplification serves as a prelude to the central features of the handbook: the speech-hearing diagnostic test and auditory training lessons.

The section on "Evaluating Speech-Hearing" reviews several speech reception studies and sets criteria for a clinically useful speech-hearing test. The test structured to meet the criteria consists of twenty lists containing twenty-five items. Each item includes three letters drawn from nineteen letters of the alphabet. The author is cognizant of the limitations of such a procedure, but feels the practical virtues of a test so constructed outweigh the limitations. Responses ninety percent correct are designated as adequate listening ability for conversation.

The body of the handbook is a series of

talker-listener auditory training exercises. Each lesson consists of a speaker list and two answer sheets and is preceded by suggestions to the teacher. The lessons are seven in number, progressing from letters and numbers to words and sentences. Each lesson is further divided for special purposes into two or more units, and each subdivided unit contains several lists of items. Scoring the lessons and the diagnostic test is relatively simple.

This handbook appears to the reviewer to be practical and flexible and its judicious use cannot but be of real value to the teacher and the therapist.

KEITH R. ST. ONGE,
University of New Mexico

SPEECH: A HANDBOOK OF VOICE TRAINING, DICTION, AND PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Dorothy Mulgrave. With Chapters by Wilbur E. Gilman and Wilbert L. Pronovost. (College Outline Series, No. 89). New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1954; pp. xvii+270. $1.50.

According to the prefatory note, the present volume is intended to serve either as a textbook or as a "general supplement for use with specialized textbooks." The book contains two general sections. Part One, which follows a brief introductory chapter, is devoted to the "Speech Arts" and includes chapters on public speaking, argumentation and debate (by Gilman), and on semantics, group discussion, parliamentary procedure, oral interpretation, dramatics, and speaking over the air. Part Two, the "Speech Sciences," contains chapters on the mechanisms of speech and hearing (by Pronovost), and on speech pathology and the sounds of American English.

The material is presented in a concise and clearly organized manner and should be most useful to a beginning student who wishes to get a general idea of the range of the speech field. The volume might also be useful as a text in a beginning college or junior college survey course. One of the chief values of the book is the "Tabulated Bibliography of Standard Textbooks" which appears in the Preface. The Bibliography lists a number of the well-known texts in the various fields, and cites references pertinent to the various topics treated by the authors. A useful supplementary feature is the "Quick Reference Table to Standard Textbooks."

The book is obviously too abbreviated in scope to permit adequate treatment of any one topic. The readily available supplementary references, however, would facilitate its use as a basic outline for course work. Attempts at brevity can easily lead to the distortions of oversimplification, and thus a student reading this book without benefit of counsel might get an unrealistic view of the various phases of speech and drama. The purposes of the book per se, however, seem ably accomplished.

WARD RASMUS,
San Jose State College

TEACHING SPEECH IN HIGH SCHOOLS. By Willard J. Friederich and Ruth A. Wilcox. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1953; pp. xi+487. $4.75.

This book brings together opinions of authorities on persistent problems of speech education and directs the teacher to specific methods for improving speech habits. Its distinguishing characteristic lies in the number of carefully selected, well documented, exact quotations organized under the three sections of the book: Part One, "An Approach to Teaching the Fundamentals of Speech"; Part Two, "Teaching the Forms of Speech"; Part Three, "Evaluating Results of the Teaching of Speech."

Part One, which is made up of three chapters, attempts in Chapter One to help the speech teacher to locate himself in the general education picture, and to find his responsibility in the secondary school. Chapter Two aims at consideration for all students from the handicapped to the gifted and directs diagnoses to discover needs. Chapter Three is devoted to the direct improvement of such elements of speech as poise, bodily action, voice, diction, language and meaning, speech style, interpersonal relations and creative listening.

Part Two, consisting of thirteen chapters covering the various types of speech activity generally encountered on the secondary level, is the major part of the book. Because a very special attempt has been made to treat each activity thoroughly, this section is repetitive and confused. Principles which should be mastered and applied as general guides, applicable in teaching every speech activity, are stated in slightly different language in each chapter and never recognized as basic laws of learning.

Part Three is made up of two chapters: "The Principles of Evaluation" and "Techniques of Measurement in Speech." Here we have helpful checklists, charts, rating scales, and descriptions of various types of examinations. The picture of the adolescent who is to be graded

is not clear, which is unfortunate since an understanding of his peculiar characteristics is at the heart of successful evaluation.

According to the Preface, *Teaching Speech in High Schools* was written for the beginning teacher. With this teacher in mind, the authors have made available numerous quotations related to major controversial issues in speech. They have hoped in this way to help the inexperienced to evolve individual philosophies. In my estimation the book will not accomplish this. The numerous short opinions taken out of context, quoted directly without interpretation, succeed in clouding rather than clarifying issues.

The chief contribution of the book rests in numerous specific devices, methods, and techniques which can be recommended by the authors because they are the result of practical experience.

GLADYS L. BORCHERS,
University of Wisconsin

LEARNING PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE. By Alice Sturgis. New York: The McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1953; pp. xvi+358. $4.00.

By clearly exposing the background, theory, and general rules for conducting meetings and assemblies, this work makes a contribution to the literature on parliamentary law. It avoids the mistake of too many books of giving rules without showing how they fit into a whole pattern of procedure. There are so many rules that many who try to learn parliamentary law find only complexity and lack of clarity about what comes first, what last, what is more important, and what less. Miss Sturgis goes far in removing this complexity, though she does this in part by eliminating many less frequently used, but none-the-less occasionally most important rules. This will leave the student who wishes to have complete knowledge of the subject inadequately prepared. For one example, what happens to the previous question if a motion is laid on the table, referred to a committee, or becomes old business in another meeting? Written in commendable literary style, the work makes a particular contribution in Part One, "Procedure: Its Principles and General Rules," in Part Three, "Organizations: Their Structure and Functions," and in "Definitions of Parliamentary Terms." In Part Two, a discussion of parliamentary motions and procedures, some rules purposely vary somewhat from those parliamentarians are used to. With commendable discrimination, a few traditional rules are eliminated; and another, *To Fix Time to Which to Adjourn,* is combined with *To Recess.*

It is unfortunate, however, that the author minimizes the work of General Henry Robert as outdated and encouraging "frustration and disagreement." Robert's manual is not scripture from on high; but it has served and is serving a great social need, is far from outdated, and does not in the slightest degree encourage the "fight image" or *advocate* obstructive methods. Furtherance of the democratic process necessitates frustrating a temporary, unrepresentative majority so that a true majority may prevail: hence, Robert's inclusion of the motion *To Reconsider and Have Entered on the Minutes.* Miss Sturgis omits this motion, and also the procedure of "calling up" the simple motion of *Reconsider,* and thus omits the principal defense against temporary majorities. This work (and *Sturgis' Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure,* on which this book is based) represents scholarship and initiative, and its legal approach has value. However, the author makes too much of a fetish of this, as if it were the only consideration, a position which cannot be supported. Though this work and the *Code* claim to be a new parliamentary approach, in reality they are an abridged and sometimes usefully modified *Robert's Rules.* They treat the more obvious, usual procedures of meetings and should thus serve a real need of thousands of organizations. They cannot, however, be considered a substitute for *Robert's* in the preparation of college students for organizational and legislative leadership.

This is an attractive work of printing and bookmaking, with cartoons illustrating numerous jingles on almost every third page. A considerable proportion of these, however, are irrelevant and non-illustrative, thus raising the question of purpose. It is doubtful if many college teachers will feel that they have to carry over comic-book practices to college students in order to interest and teach them. Intelligent students might, themselves, resent the implication. Does the publisher assume that sound instructional material must be made palatable to college students and emotionally mature community leaders by jingle-cartoon relief? Does this represent a new approach to publishing which will be extended to more and more texts?

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON,
New York University

LEADERSHIP TRAINING IN INTERGROUP EDUCATION: EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1953; pp. 243. $2.50.

The education world has become "workshop conscious." In fact almost every kind of conference in education has the term "workshop" tacked on somewhere in the program. Unfortunately, many so-called "workshops" do not by any stretch of imagination fit the requisites of "The Workshop Way of Learning," as Kelley has described it. It is significant, therefore, that a considerable body of literature is developing which describes the application of the workshop principle to specific training objectives and content problems. Hilda Taba's report of the six workshops in Intergroup Education held at the University of Chicago from 1945 to 1950 is a significant contribution to this body of material.

One of the more significant aspects of the report is the attempt to evaluate the outcomes and the values of the workshops. Unlike many reports of this nature this study admits frankly to the great difficulties in making adequate evaluation and qualifies its observations very well. Techniques of measurement included interview, questionnaire, follow-up studies, sociometric schedules, case-study tests, critical observation of learning activities, personal testimonials concerning feelings and impressions of the experience, and staff observation and analysis.

In summarizing the experience and drawing conclusions from the study some very significant generalizations were explored. It was felt that the focus of learning on action projects holds an important clue to the nature and value of the workshop. Further, it was felt that the action principle needed to be supported with an integration of ideas from many different sources. The report makes adequate warning about the danger of assuming that the action approach is a "magic wand." It requires ". . . a carefully planned organization of the entire program, from designing the levels of work to thoughtful selection of materials to be used."

The emphasis on group discussion and group procedures was balanced by other techniques. The great difficulty of deciding just what type of techniques work best for given conditions was constantly recognized. The planners tried ". . . to avoid an imbalance in the direction of learning experiences which were apt to induce passivity and to reduce active responsibility for learning processes." The Chicago workshops seemed to show that no one isolated technique was efficacious: it was the interrelation of the various techniques in particular sequences that seemed to provide the greatest value. As to just what sequences were most appropriate the report states that the evidence is insufficient to determine. Some consistency in pattern, however, was required and the study emphasizes the significance of this.

In general the report is a provocative bit of work that helps to raise and point up many of the critical problems involved in workshop planning and organization. Many problems are still unsolved in respect to the organization and function of such meetings. This study does not gloss over these problems nor ignore them. The era of viewing workshops through rose-colored glasses is apparently being replaced by a period of objective search for the facts. Interesting and amazing things do happen in many workshops, and we need to know more about the why and how of these things. This report should help to define some of the variables of studies aimed at the discovery of facts concerning these phenomena.

JOHN KELTNER,
University of Oklahoma

GROUP DYNAMICS: RESEARCH AND THEORY. By Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1953; pp. xiii+642. $6.00.

This excellent book answers splendidly the great need for a selective reporting of significant research done recently on group relations and group functioning. Its reach is wide; its adaptation of varied materials to the unity of the volume is praiseworthy; its chapters introducing the major sections are discriminating and clear.

The authors have chosen six theoretically defined problem areas, and within each have selected significant articles presenting (with few exceptions) empirical findings from quantitative research. These reports represent the work of fifty-one scholars who have investigated in widely varied situations and from many different points of interest.

The six problem-areas are these:

Approaches to the Study of Groups
Group Cohesiveness
Group Pressures and Group Standards
Group Goals and Group Locomotion
The Structural Properties of Groups
Leadership

These reports have been reprinted from various sources with excellent diagrams and charts; for maximum contribution to the efficiency of

the volume some of them have been carefully condensed from chapters or from more technical or lengthy articles.

The authors have written remarkably able introductions to each section. Here they explain the scope of the problem-area under consideration, discuss terms, review antecedent research where necessary, and give a brief overview of the studies to be reported in the section. These are extremely well-done, careful appraisals, and if read in succession—even without the excellent detailed research reports which they introduce—give the reader an integrated picture of the whole field of group dynamics.

This volume gives an effective picture of research completed; it vividly suggests wide reaches of work yet to be done in exploring the functioning of groups. It will be of much value indeed to teachers, researchers, social workers—to all who work seriously with groups.

LAURA CROWELL,
University of Washington

PEOPLE IN LIVINGSTON: A READER FOR ADULTS LEARNING ENGLISH. By Virginia French Allen. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1953; pp. vi+122. $1.25.

Foreign students who have an elementary knowledge of English will find this an excellent book. The author has skillfully embodied the principles of learning a foreign language into a series of twenty prose selections that are easily readable, conversational in style, idiomatic, amusing, and provocative of considerable discussion. The unifying theme of *People in Livingston* is the activity of the middle-class in America in the year 1953. Since their cultural habits are in marked contrast to those of people in other countries, the readings provide a basis for lively speaking situations. Line drawings that depict the characters in action, accompany the text.

In each dialogue or story several grammar patterns are repeated over and over. Objective tests of comprehension follow each unit in the form of multiple-choice questions. The total vocabulary is limited to 800 words, 600 of which are presumed to be familiar to the student. There are 200 "new words" which appear with an explanation in footnotes when they are first used and are then repeated in alphabetical order at the end of the book. The plan is to be commended.

One might take exception to some of the definitions which are connotative, restricted, or on a few occasions even beg the question. An example is the explanation of Socialists—"There are many Republicans and many Democrats in the United States, but there are not so many Socialists." Words that are not so controversial fare much better.

The reading material has been so carefully organized that it can be used by English language teachers as a model in the construction of passages with more advanced vocabularies and other linguistic structures. The colloquial style and the disciplined composition of the material lend the readings to effective use by teachers of the deaf, for whose students spoken English is also a foreign language.

BEATRICE JACOBY,
Queens College

BRIEFLY NOTED

CAPTAIN JOHN SMITH: HIS LIFE AND LEGEND. By Bradford Smith. Philadelphia: The J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953; pp. 375. $5.00.

In the rigorous re-examination which our early history is undergoing, it was inevitable that some writers would be attracted to the maze of legend and fact that is the fabulous Captain Smith: adventurer, soldier, slave, explorer, colonist, President of Virginia, Admiral of New England, and historian. Now, Bradford Smith's biography seriously compares the quite copious writings of the Captain with other accounts and the Captain's own sources. With the aid of a competent monograph on the Hungarian and Transylvanian campaigns of 1601-1602 by Laura Polanyi Smith and shrewd evaluations of place-names used by the Captain in his *True Travels*, the author seems to substantiate much of John Smith's story of his European wanderings, battles, slavery, and escape.

Likewise, the Virginia and New England narratives have been diligently compared. Especially fine re-analysis of motives and other elements in the historical evidence bring Bradford Smith to conclude that Pocahontas probably did rescue Captain John and that most of his American stories are to be believed. So, the Smith story has completed a full cycle from his original narrative through extensive repudiation to an elaborate reaffirmation.

Aside from some references to Captain John's speaking in Virginia, some excerpts from which are compared for styles, many historically minded students of public address will enjoy a volume which combines a romantic life of adventure with problems in historiogra-

phy so as to produce a very satisfactory equivalent of a first-rate detective story.

GEORGE V. BOHMAN,
Wayne University

PETER E. DIETZ: LABOR PRIEST. By Mary Harrita Fox. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1953; pp. ix+285. $4.75.

In recounting the role of Peter Dietz as a labor priest, the author details the influence of the Church upon the American social movement in the early twentieth century. Father Dietz was instrumental in keeping the A. F. of L. conservative in its fight against Marxian Socialism. He agitated for Catholic industrial conferences, worked out contracts for the building trades in Cincinnati, and set up the first Catholic labor college in the nation. His personal friends, such leaders as John P. Frey, Daniel Tobin, Matthew Woll, and Philip Murray, gratefully recall his work. Said Murray: "He strongly voiced the rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively. This he did at a time when few public figures were willing to do so. . . . His was one of the clear voices of the Church for social justice through union organization. In his field he was a pioneer."

It should be interesting to the readers of the *Journal* that public speaking and parliamentary procedure were incorporated into the curricula of the labor colleges and schools of social service which Father Dietz projected and organized.

The book is a revision of the author's doctoral dissertation and reads as such. It is a valuable reference work.

WILLIAM J. ELSEN,
University of Notre Dame

THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS IN CONGRESS. By George G. Galloway. New York: The Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1953; pp. xii+689. $6.00.

The author of this work is an experienced observer of events in Washington, D. C. As Senior Specialist, in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress he brings to his writing the thoroughness of high scholarship and a style that makes for interesting reading. The approach is realistic. The author cites example after example to illustrate his contentions.

Like *The Legislative Struggle* by Bertram M. Gross (McGraw-Hill, 1953), this book should prove to be of considerable value to students of contemporary public address in the United States Congress. In the sense that the Congress and its committees provide both "audiences" and discussion groups for the nation's legislators, the analysis by Galloway is excellent, particularly in his chapters concerning "The Individual Congressman" and procedures on the floor and in committee. The influence of the executive in the legislative process is treated in detail of value to students interested in the legislative influence and effectiveness of speeches by the President of the United States.

ROBERT F. RAY,
State University of Iowa

THE YALTA BETRAYAL. By Felix Wittmer. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers, Ltd., 1953; pp. 135. $1.25.

This short paper bound book, written in a loose, journalistic, slangy style, purports to show that "the Yalta Pact itself represents a betrayal of American principles" and that "the Communist world conspiracy assailed and undermined America without and within."

WALDO W. BRADEN,
Louisiana State University

A GUIDE TO HELP THE SEVERELY HARD-OF-HEARING CHILD. By Helen Hulick Beebe. Basel, Switzerland: S. Karger, 1953.

This little book is presented, the author tells us in the foreword, to demonstrate to the reader the importance of hearing aids and auditory training for the very young hard-of-hearing child. Six well chosen and well recounted case histories illustrate the point. It is hard to see how the reader can be left with any doubt of our ability and obligation to give severely hard-of-hearing children early opportunity to learn to hear and to speak. Mrs. Beebe's contention that this will frequently obviate the need for training in a school for the deaf is well supported by the experiences of these children and their parents.

The remainder of the book is a very brief survey of methods of hearing testing and training for young hearing handicapped children. Many clinicians will prefer not to use it as a guide to parents, because of the author's firmly stated preference for the use of *Urbantschitsch* whistles in testing and the chewing method in training. On the other hand, the presentation is too compact to be very useful to the clinician himself. It is to be hoped that the limitations of the latter half of the book will not restrict the circulation of

the case histories which make up its first—and better—half.

GEORGE HERMAN,
University of Michigan

SPEECH COMPOSITION. By William Norwood Brigance. (Second Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953; pp. vii+385. $3.00.

This revision leaves "unchanged the basic principles of the earlier [1937] edition," but we note with interest that at least four illustrations from the speeches of William Jennings Bryan have been eliminated—examples from Herbert Hoover and Estes Kefauver substitute for two of them; Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Speech Materials File" replaces Irvin S. Cobb's card catalogue of short stories; several illustrations from Winston Churchill's speeches have been inserted; an essay on higher education replaces one on the tariff problem.

Brigance has indeed succeeded in bringing his own supporting materials up to date. As before, this text identifies and clarifies the timeless principles of effective public address in a challenging, interesting manner. It continues to be an outstanding contribution to speech pedagogy.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
Washington University

YOU'RE THE SPEAKER. By Vera Gough. New York: William Morrow & Company, 1954; pp. 158. $2.50.

Vera Gough has written this book for the person who would teach himself to be a speaker. She divides each chapter into two sections. First, by using many illustrations, she develops the importance of a particular aspect of a speech: then in the second portion she presents tests by which a person may check his ability and by which he may measure his improvement. For example, she deals with timing, active listening, volume of voice, how to sit on the platform, etc. Chapter Sixteen has some interesting suggestions for the fashion commentator. However, the tendency is to oversimplify the problems discussed—do this or don't do this and success will be yours. The speech trained person will find little that is new or of interest.

ALICE DONALDSON,
Clayton High School, St. Louis

INTERPRETATIVE READING. By Sara Lowrey and Gertrude E. Johnson. (Revised Edition). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953; pp. xvii+595. $3.75.

The major changes in this revised edition are found in the foreword, with its excellent discussion of the core position held by interpretation in the speech field, and in an added chapter on bodily action. Great stress is placed on the inter-relationship of voice and body and of feeling and body. The expanded discourse on empathy points to the importance of the whole body responding to the situation. Character delineation receives new treatment with the emphasis placed upon mental attitude. The "offstage technique" is explained and advocated.

The example and discussion of the lecture recital and the syllabus for a college course in interpretative reading are of greater value than the deleted Calendar of Programs.

This sound textbook expounding "thinking with the senses" has been made even more valuable by these additions and revisions.

LESLIE IRENE COGER,
Southwest Missouri State College

HEALTH AND SAFETY PLAYS AND PROGRAMS. By Aileen Fisher. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1953; pp. viii+267. $3.50.

This collection of plays, skits, group readings, songs and recitations is an attempt to enliven the teaching of health and safety by the use of dialogue or rhyme, and sometimes by a combination of the two, that is considerably less than felicitous. There is little originality or excitement in the handling of topics and themes. No preface or foreword is included, but the book is apparently intended for use in the lower grades of the elementary school. It is the opinion of this reviewer that any reasonably intelligent group of fourth graders could develop materials as good as those offered, and the children would profit by the experience of doing their own thinking and planning. This collection is banal and fails to provide situations or problems calculated to evoke the creative imagination of lively youngsters. The author depends very largely upon pun and parody to supply rather labored touches of humor. "Production Notes" provided for each of the fourteen "plays" in the volume add nothing to what the reader can easily figure out from the scripts themselves.

The elementary school teacher who is desperate for material may find the book useful on occasion. It is not of the calibre that wears well enough to become a permanent addition to the resourceful teacher's working kit.

EVELYN KONIGSBERG,
New York City Board of Education

PARKER'S TELEVISION PLAYS. By Kenneth T. Parker. Minneapolis: The Northwestern Press, 1954; pp. 245. $2.75.

This collection of eight plays, all written by Ken Parker, is an attempt to make original television scripts available at low royalty cost for amateur production on local television stations. Mr. Parker strives for variety in the collection by including his versions of farce, comic, supernatural, suspense, horror, mystery and tragic drama. He is probably best in the plots which depend on elements of suspense. None of the dramas present insurmountable production problems and this type of collection could be quite useful to college, university and little theatre groups who seek outlet in staging television drama either as a laboratory project or for local broadcast. The volume also includes a chapter by Joseph Carleton Beal outlining some of the television production problems faced by outside groups or workshops in producing drama programs over local television stations.

GLENN STARLIN,
University of Oregon

WEIRD TALES OF OLD JAPAN. By Eisaburo Kusano. Tokyo: Tokyo News Service, Ltd., 1953; pp. iii+127. $2.50.

Although poorly bound, this small volume presents a rich collection of some of the best folk tales of old Japan. These are tales which have provided the backgrounds for some ten Noh plays (Japan's oldest classic drama, originating in the Shinto religious ceremonies) and for six Kabuki dramas, all of which are in the contemporary repertoire.

In each tale, the original story is outlined, followed by a summary of its Noh treatment, and then its Kabuki adaptation if any. Three interesting sections on ghost-lore, an introduction to Noh plays, and a discussion of the origin of the *Oni*, or demons of Japan, are included. Similar to our Western witches, the *Oni* are humans, either dead or alive, possessing unusual occult powers by which they can perform miraculous deeds either for good or evil. They are always disguised at the beginning of the tale, but their true identity is revealed in the climax scenes.

The ten illustrations, though poorly printed, enrich the volume for the Western reader. This book will be of interest both to the student of Japanese theatre and literature, and to all who are interested in the rich heritage of theatre throughout the world.

BETTY MCGEE VETTER,
University of Virginia, Ext. Div.

GUIDE TO AMERICAN LITERATURE AND ITS BACKGROUNDS SINCE 1890. By Howard Mumford Jones. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953; pp. 151. $1.50.

Intended as a guide to American literature and its background since 1890, this volume presents selective lists of books (sometimes annotated in two parts. Part One contains books about literature in five main divisions plus lists of magazines, historical events, and memorable publishing dates. Part Two gives literary titles in three divisions. Major divisions are analyzed into numerous subdivisions intended to "impose intellectual order upon confusion." These lists will prove useful for ready reference to students and teachers.

GUY CARDWELL,
Washington University

TOWARD A DEMOCRATIC WORK PROCESS. By Fred H. Blum. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. xxi+229. $3.50.

Of primary interest to industrial relations and management experts, this book should be of vital interest and concern to the speech profession and will substantiate the growing awareness of the vast problem of industrial communications. In a searching analysis of management and labor practices in a major industry (George A. Hormel & Company) where he spent almost two years on research, the author describes the forces converging "toward a democratic work process," draws conclusions, and makes recommendations. All this is done in an interesting and absorbing narrative account of the company organization, union progress and activities, and worker attitudes.

For the student of communication there are these thought-provoking items: a large percentage of workers do not want to participate in solving management problems, believing that management is a special field for those who supervise them; self-expression does not follow automatically by telling workers they are free to express themselves; only a small percentage of workers attend and participate in their own union meetings; real worker participation and expression can only be achieved within a truly democratic structure, thus necessitating changes in the traditional organization of industries which will bring about committees and group

relationships where management and labor both feel they are working toward a common goal.

HAROLD P. ZELKO,
The Pennsylvania State University

HOW TO BE A BOARD OR COMMITTEE MEMBER. By Roy Sorenson. New York: Association Press, 1953; pp. 64. $1.00.

This book is a popular condensation of the author's manual on board organization, *The Art of Board Membership*, published in 1950 (The essential detail of the earlier book is presented in more graphical form, and most of the cartoons by George Lichty have been retained). This manual is designed primarily for members of social agency boards, and seems to have a two-fold purpose: (1) to acquaint the new board member with the operation of a board, and (2) to outline the relation of the board to the executive of the agency. The title however, is misleading. Though Mr. Sorenson suggests that "this small book" might well be packaged in a kit of materials for new board members, only four pages and two cartoons are concerned directly with the responsibilities of board members. Much more attention is given to the roles of the board chairman and the executive. The author's expressed purpose is to offer practical suggestions which combine the concepts, values and practices of both management and social work. However, the attempted balance between these two approaches seems to give more emphasis to the structure and function of boards than to the human relations problems with which they must deal. As a quick index, however, to the general problems of board organization, this primer for board members of voluntary social organizations should be useful to the new board member, the board chairman, and the agency executive.

LOUISE GOBLE,
Washington University

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE MADE EASY: A VISUAL AID BASED ON ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER. By Rheva Ott Shryock. Ellenton, Florida: College Offset Press, 1953; pp. 16. $2.50.

As a visual aid for quick reference, this work is practicable and accurate. Listed on what appears to be a first page are all the motions of parliamentary procedure. This page is broken up into many indented pages, which can be flipped up for location of rules in syllabus form, applicable to the particular motion. The method is not new; but in this case it is singularly well arranged and made very useful.

The limitations of this and similar parliamentary syllabi, however, is that it lacks the background material essential to understanding of general procedure, of purpose in employing specific rules, and of relations of rule to rule in an integrated pattern. For this reason it would hardly serve as a basic instructional text in parliamentary law. Even so, it might be valuable in a college where parliamentary procedure is only a part of a course, were it not for the $2.50 cost. If it sold for $.75 or $1.00, a price more appropriate to its cost of production, it might be recommended as an adjunct to speech-course instruction.

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON,
New York University

TEACHING SPEECH IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL. By Karl Robinson. (Second Edition). New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954; pp. vii+438. $4.25.

This revised edition of a pioneer text in speech education has been prepared for the inexperienced prospective teacher. Although the revision is not a major one, the changes made serve to bring this valuable book up to date. The text retains its original tripartite organization: "Factors Affecting Speech Instruction," "Problems in Teaching the First Course," and "Directing Extra-class Speech Activities and Contests." Features particularly noteworthy in this revision are the guides and examples in learning which strengthen Part Two, and the addition of a carefully documented chapter on text books and teaching aids which will be welcomed by the experienced and the inexperienced alike.

The second edition of this book, like the first, is a good text. The beginning teacher will find it especially useful, since it tells him exactly what to do in the approach to speech teaching and provides him with specific techniques and devices for improving the total speech process.

GLADYS L. BORCHERS,
University of Wisconsin

PSYCHOLOGY IN THE NURSERY SCHOOL. By Nelly Wolffheim. Translated by Charles L. Hannam. New York: The Philosophical Library, Inc., 1953; pp. 144. $3.75.

This book is a worthy contribution to the field of early childhood development. It presents a significant way of understanding and helping

the young child through a modern psychological approach in the Nursery School. The author from her own practical experiences cites case studies concerning home-school and teacher-child relationships, revealing not only an objective, scientific, viewpoint but depth of understanding of children's experiences in a complex modern world.

Significant discussion concerning children's friendships, play and occupations, and demands of communal life in terms of adjustment, is presented. Of value to the speech teacher and guidance instructor is the emphasis on protecting the emotional stability of the child in developing his personality.

I think the author's thesis is to show that action and speech are based on thought and that a child can only say what he thinks. Her interest is therefore concerned with a psychoanalytical method in early childhood education in order to benefit the individual and the community.

RUBY NEVINS,
Wilson Teachers College

BOOKS RECEIVED

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII AND ALASKA. Edited by Edward Latham. The Reference Shelf, Volume 25, Number 5. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1953; pp. 197. $1.75. "Should states 49 and 50 be admitted is the question debated pro and con in the just published Reference Shelf compilation of authoritative opinion. . . ."

AID, TRADE AND TARIFFS. Edited by Clifton H. Kreps, Jr. and Juanita Morris Kreps. The Reference Shelf, Volume 25, Number 6. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1953; pp. 202. $1.75.

LANGUAGE, TRUTH AND LOGIC. By Alfred Jules Ayer. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1953; pp. 160. $1.25. A paperbound "student's edition" of the volume first published by Ayer in 1936.

THE SELECTED LETTERS OF LORD BYRON. Edited by Jacques Barzun. New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, Inc., 1953; pp. xliv+276. $3.75. Another volume in the Great Letters series, with notes and a critical introduction by the editor.

THE ANTIOCH ANTHOLOGY. Edited by Paul Bixler. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1953; pp. ix+470. $6.00. A selection of essays, stories, poetry and reviews from the Antioch College magazine, a quarterly founded for the purpose of applying "scholarship in the solution of social problems."

COLUMBIA VIKING DESK ENCYCLOPEDIA. Edited by William Bridgwater and others. New York: The Viking Press, 1953; pp. viii+1092. $7.95. A reduced version of the large one-volume *Columbia Encyclopedia*, in 31,000 articles and a million and a quarter words. In condensing entries from the parent work, the editors have labored with the needs of the "ordinary reader" in mind. Maps, illustrations, tables and an extensive system of cross reference add greatly to the serviceability of the book.

DICTIONARY OF SHAKESPEARE QUOTATIONS. Compiled by D. C. Browning. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1953; pp. v+560. $4.50. Extracts from contemporary writings on Shakespeare, brief summaries of the plays, and an index to the more than three thousand quotations, which range from "jewels five words long" to complete speeches.

LEARNING TO READ: A HANDBOOK FOR TEACHERS. By Homer L. J. Carter and Dorothy J. McGinnis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1953; pp. vii+214. $3.50. A book "designed to provide definite, specific, and practical suggestions for the improvement of reading at all levels. . . . No attempt has been made to emphasize the difference between initial instruction and corrective reading."

THE BEST HUMOR FROM PUNCH. Edited by William Cole and Illustrated by Sprod. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1953; pp. 350. $3.50. "Over one hundred sketches, articles and poems, selected with loving care from the postwar years of *Punch*."

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, FATHER AND SON. Edited by Lester E. Denonn. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953; pp. xiv+116. $3.00. "This is the seventh volume in the Beacon *Wit and Wisdom Series*, in which the highly refined 'best' of the great thinkers is presented in nugget form, following the various categories of their writings and conversations."

ADVANCING JOURNALISM. Edited by John E. Drewry. Athens, Georgia: University of

Georgia Press, 1953; pp. x+157. $2.00. "Press, Radio, Television, Periodicals, Public Relations and Advertising as seen through institutes and special occasions of the Henry W. Grady School of Journalism, 1952-1953."

THE LITERARY HISTORY OF ROME: FROM THE ORIGINS TO THE CLOSE OF THE GOLDEN AGE. By J. Wight Duff. Edited by A. M. Duff. (Third edition). New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953; pp. xvi+535. $7.50. A re-issue of the first volume of Duff's history, which has been out of print for many years. The editor has not disturbed the text of the second edition (1910), but has contributed twenty-four pages of Supplementary Bibliography citing pertinent writings of the past forty years.

A SUMMONING OF STONES. By Anthony Hecht. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954; pp. 64. $2.50. Poems, written since 1947, by an instructor in English at Bard College.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HEGEL. Edited by Carl J. Friedrich. New York: The Modern Library, 1953; pp. lxiv+552. $1.25. "Hegel's conceptions of history, philosophy, logic, politics, aesthetics, law and justice" in a volume intended for the scholar as well as the general reader. An introduction and notes are supplied by the editor.

A READER'S NOTEBOOK. Compiled by Gerald Kennedy. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1953; pp. vxiii+340. $3.95. An anthology of illustrative material for preachers and other public speakers assembled by a bishop of the Methodist Church. The book contains subject and author indexes.

VISION AND ACTION: ESSAYS IN HONOR OF HORACE M. KALLEN ON HIS 70th BIRTHDAY. Edited by Sidney Ratner. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1953; pp. xii+277. $5.00. Essays by a distinguished company, including T. V. Smith, Paul Douglas, George Boas, Sidney Hook, T. S. Eliot, John Dewey, Hu Shih and others, in honor of Professor Kallen of The New School for Social Research.

BROWNSON ON DEMOCRACY AND THE TREND TOWARD SOCIALISM. By Laurence Roemer. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1953; pp. xvi+173. $3.75. Principles of Orestes Brownson applied to contemporary issues.

TWO STUDIES IN VIRTUE. By Christopher Sykes. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953; pp. 256. $4.00. The volume includes "The Damascus Road," a study of Richard Waldo Sibthorp and his relation to various religious movements of the nineteenth century; and "The Prosperity of His Servant," a study of the origins of the Balfour Declaration and of the role played in the evolution of Zionism by the author's father.

WORLD LITERATURE: GREEK, ROMAN, ORIENTAL AND MEDIEVAL CLASSICS. By Buckner B. Trawick. Volume 1. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953; pp. vi+280. $1.50. A volume in the College Outline Series, presenting plot outlines, biographical data, historical background and evaluations.

THE THEORY OF THE LEISURE CLASS: AN ECONOMIC STUDY OF INSTITUTIONS. By Thorstein Veblen. New York: New American Library, 1953; pp. xx+261. $.35. A Mentor edition of Veblen's classic study, with an introduction by C. Wright Mills.

CAMINO REAL. By Tennessee Williams. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1953; pp. xv+161. $3.00. "The version of *Camino Real* here published is considerably revised over that presented on Broadway. There are new characters and some new scenes, and principally a new framework for the whole play provided by an ingenious prologue."

27 WAGONS FULL OF COTTON, AND OTHER ONE-ACT PLAYS. By Tennessee Williams. (Third edition). Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1953; pp. xii+238. $3.50. A new edition of Williams' early one-act plays, augmented by two pieces not previously printed, *Something Unspoken* and *Talk to Me Like the Rain*.

1001 POEMS OF MANKIND. Edited by Henry W. Wells. Atlanta, Georgia: Tupper & Love, 1953; pp. xxv+448. $5.00. "A long view of the short poem as composed on outstanding human themes over a period of thirty centuries in eighteen languages and in twenty-nine countries."

STORIES FROM THE SOUTHERN REVIEW. Edited by Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren. Baton Rouge: The Louisianna State University Press, 1953; pp. xvi+435. $6.00.

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-ONE new TV stations went on the air last year, bringing the total number to 356. Another 200 will start operating in 1954. It is the radio story all over again. About 200,000 small-screen color TV sets are expected to be produced this year. Some 27.5 million TV sets are now in use; by 1960 the total will likely increase to more than 50 million.

Shop Talk mentioned, last issue, programs and plans at seven institutions: Colorado A. and M., University of Missouri, University of Scranton, University of Wisconsin, Michigan State College, Western Reserve University, and Lehigh University.

Still the news rolls in. The Metropolitan Educational Television Association of New York City has applied for a charter; the purpose of the Association is to build and operate a noncommercial educational TV station in New York City. WQED, of Pittsburgh, expects to open within the next few months. KUTH, at Houston, began its spring semester of telecasting with eight telecourses. The University of Detroit has completed plans for full-scale participation in educational TV. Princeton University and the New Jersey Department of Education are developing an experimental series designed to improve the pronunciation of beginning students of French. A faculty committee at Princeton is studying ways of presenting educational topics to the television public. Jacksonville has opened a drive for $195,000 to build and operate an educational TV station. KQED includes various programs planned by staff members at Stanford, the University of California, the California Academy of Sciences, and others. The Board of Trustees of the Greater Washington Educational Television Association plans to launch a fund-raising campaign in April. The foregoing notes mainly come from the February 8 issue of *News*, a publication of the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television, located in the Ring Building, Washington 6, D. C.

More notes, these from a recent report of the Joint Committee on Educational TV: Eighteen persons paid a $40 fee to take a course in business law from KCMO; they listened to sixteen weekly lectures and completed exercises by correspondence. Western Reserve drew 56,000 viewers in 1952-53 for a course in elementary psychology, 66 paying $48 each for credit, and 472 registering as auditors. A demonstration of children and adults having various sorts of speech difficulties, a feature of the program "Your Child Learns to Speak," was popular. The University of Michigan and the University of Southern California are also on the air. USC, for example, has made kinescope recordings of lectures on Shakespeare by Dr. Frank Baxter, and the story of Dr. Baxter's success as television lecturer was featured in *The New York Times* for Sunday, Feb. 21, 1954. Our own correspondent sends us an attractively printed announcement of a student TV station, WAPB, at the University of Alabama, where Kenneth Harwood heads the Department of Radio and Television.

Readers who have TV responsibilities

are invited to write about developments on their campuses. The situation will develop rapidly in the twelve months ahead—think of those 200 new stations! —and we will be glad to be filled in on the details. Our scouts say that educational programs over TV are a tricky business, calling for imagination, ingenuity, the use of a variety of visual appliances. All over the country young men and women who a year ago did not know which side of a Brownie to hold up are propelling sleek and silent TV cameras around studio floors. Other young men and women are sitting in control rooms, shifting circuits and muttering a strange gibberish that comes from somebody's glossary. It is a risky and a hazardous business. We welcome notes from the survivors.

HIGH SCHOOLS throughout the country will discuss and debate foreign trade policy next school year. The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, representing the National University Extension Association, has just conducted a ballot among the high school leagues to determine the annual question; and by a wide majority the leagues say the problem area should be this:

What Should be the Foreign Trade Policy of the United States?

The leagues have approved three discussion questions and three debate problems:

Discussion Questions

What United States trade policy would best serve the interests of the American people?

What United States trade policy would best serve the interests of the free world?

What policy should the United States sustain concerning trade with Communist-Bloc nations?

Debate Propositions

Resolved: That the federal government should initiate a policy of free trade among nations friendly to the United States.

Resolved: That the reciprocal trade agreements are detrimental to the best interests of the American people.

Resolved: That the Congress should abolish protective tariffs.

The manner in which the annual topics are chosen will be of interest to *QJS* readers. At the time of the national convention of the Speech Association of America held in New York last December, the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials sponsored sessions at which various topics were proposed. Topics were presented by individuals who had made a preliminary study of them. Questions like "Is the proposition debatable?" "Is it of current interest?" "Is there adequate material on both sides?" "Is it important enough to warrant a whole year's study?" "Is it suitable for high school students?" flew thick and fast. Changes were proposed in wording. Other topics were proposed from the floor. Finally three general problem areas were chosen and submitted to a wording committee. The three areas were submitted, after close study by the wording committee, to the state debate and discussion leagues in a nation-wide referendum, each state league having one vote.

The following persons were members of the wording committee: Hugh Seabury, Iowa High School Forensic League; Bruce Roach, Texas Interscholastic League; Eunice Horne, Jacksonville, Florida, High School; Ivan Rehn, Lyons, Illinois, Township High School; Bower Aly, chairman, University of Missouri.

THE LAST INSTALLMENT of Shop Talk included interesting news about another kind of activity, the reading aloud of poetry and prose. Reading programs at Princeton, Buffalo, and Utah, a Readers' Theatre at Adelphi, Claude Rains at Louisiana State, a Reading Festival at Baylor, sections on reading aloud at various regional conferences, a plan to exchange tape recordings —these added up to an interesting two pages. The National Convention in New York City presented some fine programs and some sensible talk about the art of oral interpretation. The picture is still incomplete, and we would like our college and university friends to help out on the brushwork by sending news items from all over.

Once we taught fundamentals at a big university where each of the thousand or so students enrolled was assigned the reading of a poem as a part of the regular assignments in course. For days the libraries would be combed for selections, principally of the narrative or dramatic sort, and the halls would really ring with Kipling, Browning, Sandburg, Millay, Frost, Lindsay, Robinson, Binet, Shakespeare, and the rest. The assignment was organized as a competition, each section selecting its four or five best readers. These class representatives competed in further rounds of competition, finally reaching quarterfinals, semifinals, and the

final performance itself, given in the evening before a large audience of students. By then each contestant would have given his selection much study and meditation. We have seen many classroom projects, but for pure, undiluted, eye- and ear-filling fun and inspiration, good reading of poetry is hard to beat.

ALTHOUGH THE SPEECH ASSOCIATION office was moved to Iowa City nearly three years ago, this editor still gets half a dozen letters a day on various sorts of official business.

Ordinarily these are routinely forwarded by our office staff. At times, though, the staff is puzzled by the addresses on the envelopes, and in those instances she gives us, not Orville Hitchcock, the first look.

She was wondering what to do with the letter from the Chicago magician who wanted to saw a lady in half at the coming national convention.

The idea is, naturally, an intriguing one. Instead of, for example, a presidential address by Karl Wallace, why not set up the Gold Ball Room of the Conrad Hilton as a circus ring, and let the magician cause an elephant to vanish? A good idea for an election year.

We were tempted to forward the letter forthright to Waldo Braden. But he has troubles enough of his own, or will have, after July 1. So we just filed it in the circular file.

ANOTHER LETTER WAS FROM Tim's Lobster House, of Augusta, Maine. Tim wanted to give the recipient and his lady a complimentary lobster dinner. One of the phrases carried a suggestion that Augusta, Maine, would be a suitable place for a national meeting some day. Tim, of course, is a fictitious substitute for the real name; if by chance there is a Tim's Lobster House, it must be a different establishment.

Anyway, this letter is typical of several that come each year to twitch the conscience of the Executive Secretary. Unhappily they never seem to come from handy places like Chicago or New York where the Executive Secretary and his lady might conceivably inspect a complimentary lobster. We will have no trouble forwarding this note to Kenneth Hance, for review by the Committee on Time and Place. If, however, we ever get a similar invitation from the Forum Cafeteria of Kansas City, Missouri, we are going to investigate personally.

PUBLIC SPEAKING IN BRITAIN. On Thursday, September 24, 1953, *The Times* carried the following story under the headline "Fashions in the Spoken Word—Signs of Returning Eloquence." It is of sufficient interest to reproduce in full. Says *The Times:*

Recorded utterances by persons both famous and ordinary were reproduced by Mr. Lynton Fletcher during an address which he gave last night before members of the Author's Club as their new chairman.

Mr. Fletcher, former director of recorded programmes at the B. B. C., was discussing how far the spoken word might be an index to the quality of mind and character of a speaker; and in an entertaining treatment of this theme he used many extracts from his collection of gramophone records. One of the earliest, purporting to give the authentic voice of Gladstone, was once played by Mr. Fletcher for Lady Gladstone of Hawarden and Sir George Leveson-Gower, one of Gladstone's secretaries, and was approved by both of them for its truthful effect.

Touching on changes of fashion in public speaking in the last 50 years Mr. Fletcher said that anyone listening to the few recordings that had survived from the first decade of this century would notice their rigid suppression of individuality. Poetry then was not usually read; it was recited—that was to say, declaimed with a wealth of feeling which frequently bore no relation to any known human emotion. To show the extent of the change he contrasted recordings of Beerbohm Tree and Sir John Gielgud, and then of the Prime Minister and Gladstone. This last contrast, Mr. Fletcher observed, was the more striking when we remembered that Sir Winston Churchill was probably the last of the great orators, and that his own style had undergone great changes—a point illustrated with a record of one of his speeches in 1909.

Age of Understatement. The extravagant forms and styles of speaking of some years ago suddenly gave way to a fashion and a passion for understatement. This last attitude was summed up in a *Punch* cartoon of a young man drawing his companion's attention to the beauty of the landscape in some such phrase as "That's a bit of all right," and getting the reply, "There's no need to be hysterical about it." Today the spoken word is no longer dismissed as the gift of gab; with the disappearance of affected rhetoric and the emergence of natural expression the spoken word, incalculably more potent with the coming of radio, now played a vital part in shaping the destinies both of individuals and of nations.

By a "blitzkrieg" rhetoric Hitler brought the world to the edge of disaster, but in counter-

accents of calm but inspired eloquence Sir Winston Churchill rallied the confidence of the civilized world. In an age where the spoken word was at last coming into its own, many were realizing that the human speaking voice had been for too long one of their most neglected assets. Not only on the radio or the stage did voices count. A secretary could win praise for her telephone voice. At an interview you could talk yourself into a job or out of one. At staff and salesmanship schools people were being taught that there was conversation that made friends, conversation that made enemies, and conversation that made money.

ON A COUPLE of different occasions last year, articles appeared in London Sunday papers praising the scholarship of American professors in the fields of British history and literature.

The American scholars, the articles confided, bring a different perspective to familiar literary and historical problems. Moreover, an American, or a team of Americans, often gets the support of a university or foundation behind him, and thus has the resources to examine more of the available evidence.

For example, scholars and critics from Chicago, Wisconsin, Yale, Harvard, Oberlin, Queens, Hunter, Brooklyn, Texas, Michigan State, Rutgers, and other universities are undertaking to publish the prose works of John Milton, the great advocate of freedom of speech. Yale University Press will issue the collection in a seven-volume edition. A project of this vision and compass will be applauded on both sides of the Atlantic.

HALF A DOZEN midwestern campuses are seeking new presidents. Professors gather formally and informally to discuss qualifications: the new head should be a man of vision and integrity, he should have a sense of public service, he should understand the problems of the scholar.

A president should, moreover, have an appreciation of many fields of endeavor. Some years ago we taught on a campus that had just elected a new head. "Dr. Z will make a fine administrator," said a new friend in the English department; "he has an unusual background in literature, and he himself writes very well." "It is a good and a wholesome thing to have a former law professor at the head of the institution," said another acquaintance, who, by coincidence, taught law. For a final verdict we appealed to a senior member of the Department of Speech. "Oh, yes," he said, "Dr. Z is indeed a happy choice. He is a former college debater."

DONALD BRYANT recently showed us the *New Yorker* of November 14 last, which contains a review of the new Revised Standard version of the Bible. Under the sparkling title of "The Bible in Modern Undress," reviewer Dwight Macdonald makes many comparisons between the RS and the King James version. He observes first and foremost—and here is where the review has special point for our readers—that the Bible is read aloud so often that translators should give special thought to *rhythm*. Macdonald reminds us all that the language of poetic is "connotative rather than direct, suggestive rather than explicit, decorative and incantatory rather than functional." The King James version, he goes on to say, is "wild, full of awe, poetic, and passionate"; it is therefore highly satisfying for oral reading, though it demands much from the reader.

Macdonald gives full credit to modern scholarship for producing a clearer translation of many verses. "Let no one seek his own good, but the good of a neighbor" is, he notes, preferable to "Let no man seek his own, but every man another's wealth." "I rose before dawn" is more clear than "I prevented the dawning of the morning." Nevertheless, the *New Yorker* reviewer sticks to his main theme, which is that in many instances the King James is simply better reading, i.e., better oral reading, than the Revised Standard. "Thou are the man!" of the Revised Standard, he says, "collapses in the police-report, 'You are the man!'" "Suffer the little children to come unto me" from the tenth chapter of Mark is more moving than RS's "Let the children come to me," which, he adds, "sounds like a mother at a picnic." And to change "Male and female created He them," found in the first chapter of Genesis, to "Male and female He created them," he says, "breaks the rhythm's back."

You will find this long review poetic, passionate, and full of awe. Like most *New Yorker* pieces, it combines good fun and wisdom. The many comparisons of the two texts are well worth reading to classes interested in the phrasing of ideas for oral presentation.

THIS DEPARTMENT would like to carry an announcement about any new construction or major remodelling projects on your campus as soon as your plans are formally authorized. The new quarters for the Department of Speech at the University of Akron, the Speech Correction

and Audiology Center at West Virginia, the radio broadcasting studio and speech laboratory at Redlands, radio quarters and Little Theatre at Southern Illinois, the Little Theatre at Connecticut, the Community Building and the Fine Arts Center at Wichita, the George Gershwin Theatre at Brooklyn, the TV station and enlarged new auditorium at Missouri, are examples of current building enterprises.

All of this recalls the impressive survey entitled "New Buildings for Old" by Professors Constans and Kantner, published in *QJS* just a year ago. That article, complete with pictures and floor plans, will be of continuing help to all speech and drama faculties who advise about building programs. As these authors report, "an efficient speech building does not much resemble a classroom building with offices." And the ideas will have to come from the staff that uses the building. This department loves all architects, but has a special affection for those who know how to say, "Tell us what you want and we'll put a roof over it."

THE YALE UNIVERSITY Shakespeare Festival was a prominent event on that campus in February. *The Merry Wives of Windsor* was presented at five evening performances plus a special matinee, the ticket sale reaching nearly 4,900 seats. The production was unique in that authentic Shakespeare pronunciation was used. The TV program "Omnibus" on Sunday, Feb. 21, presented scenes from this production. Shakespearean pronunciation, according to the experts, sounds like English as an Irishman would speak it, and Yale is issuing recordings to prove this thesis.

WORKSHOPS IN GUIDANCE and instruction of the adolescent and adult with cerebral palsy will be held this summer at three graduate schools of education, it has been announced by Ernest Fleischer, Chairman, Adult Vocational Advisory Board of United Cerebral Palsy.

The workshops are being held to assist teachers, counselors, social workers, therapists, nurses, and personnel in related fields in providing realistic vocational counseling to the cerebral palsied. Scholarships covering tuition and material costs, maintenance and travel, are available. The workshops will be held at Boston University, Boston, Mass., June 28 to July 8; University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., July 9 to August 3; and Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., August 10 to August 31.

THE ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL Association for the Deaf will hold its 1954 summer meeting in St. Louis, June 14-18. The theme is "Let's Face the Issues." Questions to be discussed include: "Where should the deaf child receive his education?" "What are the possibilities and limitations of auditory training?" "What are the principal issues in teaching speech?" "What contributions can be made to the understanding of the deaf child by persons in peripheral fields?"

IOWA CONFERENCE ON AUDIOLOGY. The State University of Iowa Council on Speech Pathology and Audiology will sponsor a conference on audiology, June 25 and 26. Leaders in the field will discuss such problems as the professional growth of audiology, the rehabilitation of hearing-handicapped children, and the past and potential contributions of various research methods. Cases will be presented.

A TWO-WEEK WORKSHOP in stuttering therapy will be offered under the sponsorship of the State University of Iowa Council on Speech Pathology and Audiology from June 28 through July 9. It is designed for speech correctionists confronted with practical problems in public school situations. The treatment of school-age stutterers will be discussed with emphasis on actual cases. Group therapy techniques will be highlighted. There will be demonstrations, lectures, round-table discussions, and observation in the stuttering clinic. Participation in clinical work will be arranged in accordance with each registrant's previous training and experience; there will be apprenticeship-level work as a minimum for all registrants.

Workshop leaders will be Wendell Johnson, director of the University of Iowa Speech Clinic, and Mrs. Myfanwy Chapman, Speech Correction Program, Minneapolis Public Schools.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation will be held at Webster Hall Hotel, Pittsburgh, May 14 and 15. The two-day program of research papers and symposia will be open to all individuals interested in cleft palate rehabilitation. Anyone interested in presenting a paper at this meeting should submit a one-page abstract, with two carbons, to the Program Chairman, Dr. S. M. Dupertius, 3700 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh 13.

OFFICERS OF THE RHODE ISLAND Speech Council for the 1953-54 year are: Leo Dolan, speech correctionist, Pawtucket City Schools, president; John A. Oostendorp, professor of English, Uni-

versity of Rhode Island, vice-president; Grace Carroll, speech correctionist, Providence, secretary; Leonard Moreau, speech correctionist, Pawtucket, treasurer.

THE SPEECH-THEATRE DEPARTMENT of Long Island University is planning a special subscription series of plays that, over a two-season period, will include a list of great plays representing a cross-section of theatre history, each play staged in the style of its period. Forming the nucleus of the series will be a Greek tragedy, a Roman comedy, a medieval mystery or miracle play, an Elizabethan verse tragedy, a Restoration comedy of manners, a drama from the naturalistic period, and an expressionistic fantasy from the Twenties. Dennis Brown, chairman of the department, will produce and direct the series, and the two-year program will be tied in with local community theatre groups and University alumni.

THE LONG ISLAND University Society for the Study of Stuttering, a student group composed of members and officers who are stutterers, has set up a special speech fund to pay for clinical work in the speech clinic for children from the community who can not afford clinical services and to purchase additional clinical equipment. Money for the fund is raised by the presentation of benefit shows, arranged by the Society membership, under the supervision of Mary Harden.

ORATORY, THE PRACTICE OF. Under this heading *Time* quotes, "for convenient reference," a list blandly compiled by *Punch* of a few of the "telling images" from a recent speech of a British minister:

Bold front, a
Break in the clouds, a
Daily burden, our
Faith in the future
Four corners of the earth, the
Poverty, disease and ignorance, the fight against
Record of achievement
Unity of purpose, essential

STAFF MEMBERS of the University of Missouri Speech and Hearing Clinic will go to four Missouri communities during the present semester to conduct all-day speech clinics for children of school age. The off-campus speech clinic program has provided service for more than a thousand children in forty communities in the state since January, 1947. Conferences with parents and teachers, reports sent to the schools, and follow-up visits supplement the testing program. Student clinicians participating in these clinics are under the supervision of Charlotte G. Wells, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic; Jay Sanders, clinic supervisor; and Thelma Trombly, staff clinician.

THIS IS EXACTLY the time of year when undergraduate majors planning to teach, work in speech clinics, go into TV, and the like, should be encouraged to take out student memberships in the Speech Association of America.

Some years ago the Executive Council discussed seriously the desirablity of encouraging the young men and women of the country to become members of the Association and to read its publications. Steps were taken to amend the constitution of the Association so that a new classification of membership, Student Membership, could be established. This happy result came to pass in due course, and the fee was set at $2.50: open to undergraduate students only, not graduates.

The result of this far-sighted proposal has been interesting to follow. Some institutions have enrolled a high percentage of their undergraduate majors; others, none at all. Apparently whenever a department, or a teacher, undertakes to talk to students about their professional future, enrollments follow in substantial numbers.

For his $2.50, the student may receive either *QJS* or *The Speech Teacher*. He receives, furthermore, another substantial benefit: the *privilege* of enrolling in the Teacher Placement Service at the regular fee of $5.50. Teacher Placement Service is available only to members; and this statement is interpreted to include student members. Five dollars and fifty cents, a little more than the price of a textbook, may help the enrollee to find a better scholarship or teaching appointment than he could locate by any other means.

THE FIELD OF SPEECH is the subject of a TV series over WOW in Omaha. The three-year-old series is produced by the Speech and Dramatic Arts Department of the University of Omaha and is directed by its head, Bruce Linton. The show is called "The Great Tool—Communication." Subjects have included "The Classical Backgrounds of Public Address," "Oral Interpretation," and "Modern Trends in Journalism." Already scheduled are such topics as "Communication Through Drama" and "Techniques of Discussion."

PURDUE UNIVERSITY, in association with Dunes Arts Foundation, Michigan City, Ind., furnished

instructors for accredited courses in theatre and drama at the Foundation grounds near Michigan City during the summer of 1953. Ross D. Smith serves as Director of the Foundation; Erling Kildahl as theatre director and instructor; Lawrence Marks as technical director of the theatre.

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGE. The Department of Speech at Oklahoma A. and M. College has been amalgamated with two other departments of the college to form a Department of English, Foreign Languages, and Speech. A reason for the change was primarily to reduce administrative costs, but the faculty of each of the areas will continue to maintain its separate integrity. The new policy provides for a single office force to handle the bookkeeping, stenographic work, and other clerical affairs. Professor D. T. Martin, chairman of the Department of Speech for 28 years, has retired and Professor Harry H. Anderson is now senior professor of speech.

GENERAL EISENHOWER always made fine copy for teachers of speech. Those interested in conference and discussion will find many inspiring illustrations in Chester Wilmot's engaging book about World War II, *Struggle for Europe*. The proof is clearly set forth that one reason for the tactical surprise effected on D-Day was the result of a series of last-minute staff conferences at which the contingencies of wind, fog, and tide were carefully rediscussed and reappraised. In fact, Eisenhower prepared for his D-Day conferences by having trial discussions earlier, so that members of the group would learn how to evaluate each other's judgment.

Now General Eisenhower is President Eisenhower, and the flow of copy continues. Example: he asks for oral reports rather than written documents. Example: he rehearses the members of his cabinet so they can effectively present, orally, with visual aids, the goals of his administration. After the rehearsal, the speakers, with their revised speeches and charts, present their plans to congressional leaders. Example: in order to improve his TV appearances, he confers with TV producer Robert Montgomery, who advises about such details as facial expression, poise and gesture, use of the teleprompter, and conversational directness. Advice given the President about *inventio* is, however, not revealed by the news dispatches.

STATE ASSOCIATION MEETS. The annual convention of the Louisiana Education Association was held in Lafayette November 23-25. The speech division met on the second day in both morning and afternoon sessions. In the morning Charles Campbell, speech correctionist of the Iberville Parish Schools, talked on "The Speech Correction Program in Louisiana" and Albert Capuder, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a discussion on "Speech Rallies and their Problems." In the afternoon Waldo Wasson, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a panel discussion on "My Role in the Speech Correction Program"; Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, led a discussion on "Problems of Coaching Debate"; and students of Jennings High School gave a drama demonstration under the direction of Mrs. Luke Richard. Officers for the coming year are Paul Pennington of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, president, succeeding Oran Teague of Louisiana State University; and Mrs. L. J. Berry of Abbeville High School, vice-president, succeeding Mr. Pennington. The executive secretary, Edna West, was elected last year for a two-year term.

THE THIRD WESTERN TRAINING LABORATORY in Group Development will be held at Idyllwild, California, between August 15 and 27. The laboratory is intended to provide understanding and skills for individuals who want to improve their effectiveness in working with groups. The training staff will be made up of faculty members from various universities as well as from active group leaders in business, government, industry, public health, education, social welfare, and the like. The meetings are sponsored by the Department of Conferences and Special Activities of the University of California, Los Angeles 24.

TRAINING LABORATORY. Based upon eight years of pioneering research and experience in the field of training leaders, the National Training Laboratory in Group Development will hold its usual three-week summer laboratory session at Gould Academy, Bethel, Maine. The dates will be from June 20 through July 10.

Approximately 125 applicants will be accepted for this session. Persons involved in problems of working with groups in a training, consultant, or leadership capacity in any field are invited to apply. The office of the laboratory is 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

A NEW SPEAKER SERVICE has been approved by the Committee on Forensic Activities at the University of Missouri. Student speakers have signed up to give a variety of talks on all manner of places, topics, and personalities; and

university debate and discussion teams are available for scheduling. Following the usual speaker-bureau plan, these students will appear before community and other groups seeking programs. Thomas L. Fernandez, assistant director of forensics at Missouri, is in charge of the service.

OXFORD DEBATERS AT PITTSBURGH. The Oxford University debaters, John Peters and Patrick Mayhew, participated in the Sixth Annual Cross-Examination Tournament at the University of Pittsburgh, December 12. The Britishers debated the national collegiate topic in two regular rounds of the tournament against competing American schools. According to the Institute of International Education, which arranges international debate tours, this was the first time for a British team to take part in a college tournament on the American topic and under standard tournament conditions.

AS A LIVING memorial to their son, Larry E. Woods, former Kansas State College student killed in World War II, Mr. and Mrs. E. E. Woods, the parents, of Independence, Kansas, have provided a fund to finance a speech contest at Kansas State each semester. Freshmen and sophomores enrolled in Oral Communication I are eligible. The contest was scheduled for December 8. The son was greatly interested in effective oral presentation.

FORUM HOURS AT BUFFALO. A series of campus-wide forum hours on subjects of international, national, and collegiate interest is under way at the State University College for Teachers at Buffalo.

DEBATE AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY. The Hall of Fame Debate Tournament, inaugurated and directed by John Herder, this year received applications from 36 colleges. A unique feature was the round of panel discussions on the national debate question held with the co-operation of the Secretariat of the United Nations in the Headquarters Building. After the panel discussion the visiting teams returned to the Heights' campus to engage in a series of debates, climaxed by a dinner at which a trophy was awarded to the winning team.

ANNUAL CONVENTION. The Rocky Mountain Forensic League held its annual convention and tournament on the campus of Colorado A. & M. College, November 6 and 7. Brigham Young University, the University of Utah, Utah State College, Montana State College, the University of Wyoming, Denver University, the University of Colorado, and Colorado A. & M. College were represented. Colorado State College of Education at Greeley was unanimously admitted as the ninth member of the League after the report of a special investigating committee determined that Greeley, Colorado, was within sight of the Rocky Mountains and was thereby declared loyal.

"IF YOU ARE WRITING A BOOK" is a series of pamphlets available to teachers and others wrestling with the problem of a manuscript. The series is written in entertaining style, and its suggestions make good sense. A note to The Dryden Press, 31 West 54th Street, New York, will probably bring you copies.

COMPETITIONS FOR ANNUAL FULBRIGHT appointments open May 1 and close October 15. The list of participating countries is an impressive one: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, Thailand, Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom, to name only a few.

Members of the Association who would like to teach or study abroad are urged to seek information about these appointments. The allowance is sufficient to meet normal living expenses of a single person during one academic year, and is paid in the currency of the participating country. The United States government earned substantial credits from various countries which, after the last war, purchased munitions or other supplies from it. A speech professor who accepts an appointment, for example, in The Netherlands, is thereby indirectly being exchanged, let us say, for an old tank; the Dutch get the tank, and the United States gets its professor back, culturally enriched by a year's stay on the continent and therefore presumably a better teacher of young Americans.

For further information, write the Institute of International Education, 1 East 67th Street, New York 21, N. Y. The Institute, incidentally, publishes a good many announcements about other opportunities for foreign study: on our desk, for instance, are leaflets about study in Cuba, France, Latin America, Switzerland, Ceylon, Austria, Denmark and Iceland, and a dozen others. Its annual report, just issued, is an exciting document.

The various consulates are also in a position to give information about study and teaching in their countries. The British Information Service has offices in the National Press Building, Washington 5, D. C. The French Cultural Counselor is located at 972 Fifth Avenue, New York City. An Austrian address is Consulate General, 31 East 69th Street, New York 21. Adult education in Scandinavia is handled by the American Scandinavian Council for Adult Education, 127 East 73rd Street, New York 21. These addresses are only a few from a long list.

If your institution has a Fulbright adviser on its staff, or a committee on foreign study, you will no doubt find the above addresses and many others already on file. A good handbook, containing some 300 pages of information, is *Study Abroad*, published at $2.00 and distributed in this country by Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.

THE SPEECH AND HEARING CLINIC of the University of Southern California has acquired a new stereophonic auditory training unit as a gift from the Park View Women's Club, which is financially aiding the Clinic. Teacher training for the hard-of-hearing pre-school child began last semester in conjunction with the Tracy Clinic. To facilitate this work, six tuition scholarships are being offered by the Tracy Clinic. Students are now training with aphasic cases at the Veteran's Administration at Sawtelle. Work with hard-of-hearing children and their parents, called the Life Work Shop, is under the direction of Dr. Morkovin.

THE UNIVERSITY OF Southern California's "Shakespeare on TV," broadcast by Frank C. Baxter, Professor of English, has already been mentioned in this department. Some specific facts in connection with the broadcast are of interest. The enrollment during the fall semester totalled 1,233, including 886 auditors and 332 students for credit. The attendance at the final exam held on the campus reached 213, 189 making passing grades. A weekly audience of 400,000 was estimated by KNXT, the originating station. Syllabi and copies of the plays to be studied were made available.

The program has received various recognitions: the Sylvania award as the nation's best local educational program; the eleventh annual distinguished achievement award of TV-Radio Life; the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences' "Emmy" for the best local public service program, and an "Emmy" for Dr. Baxter as the outstanding male personality on TV in the Los Angeles Area.

Other programs include: "Halls of Science," a weekly half-hour program on KNBH, presenting a different professor each week lecturing on some phase of science, recently commended by the National Association for Better Radio and Television; "Teleforum," an hour program aired each Sunday night on KTLA, presenting panel discussions on world and national problems, with Chancellor Rufus B. von KleinSmid as moderator; "Debut," a half-hour, Sunday evening presentation of KCOP, presenting outstanding young musical talent. Dean Raymond Kendall of the School of Music of USC is chairman of "Debut's" board of judges, although the University does not sponsor or arrange the program.

OREGON COLLEGE OF EDUCATION held an open house on February 26 and 27 to inaugurate the newly-constructed facilities for the Western Oregon Co-operative Speech and Hearing Center. Robert L. Mulder is director of the Center.

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE plans to occupy its new $1,225,000 Speech and Drama building in the fall. It will include two theatres and attendant rooms such as shops, costume labs and storage, makeup, dressing rooms, radio studios with TV rehearsal room, speech and hearing clinic rooms equipped for testing and diagnosis, classrooms, and offices.

THE AMERICAN MUSICAL SHOW, which in recent years has been gaining stature both here and abroad as an important new form of art, has become a collector's item. Yale University has inaugurated a collection of the literature of musical comedy, to be known as the Yale Collection of the Literature of the American Musical Theatre. The materials were gathered principally by Robert L. Barlow, managing editor of the Yale alumni magazine, and consist of about 5,000 items, including sheet music, programs, complete scores, and recordings by original casts or artists.

THE INTERVIEW WITH Harry S. Truman published in the last *QJS*, in which Eugene E. White and Clair R. Henderlider set down the answers of the former president to questions concerning his ideas about speechmaking, has attracted wide attention over the country. The *New York Times* carried a story about the interview in its editions of February 28.

Another article in the same *QJS* entitled "How I Prepare My Sermons," by Charles A. McGlon, presenting contributions of Fosdick, Dawson, Sockman, Flynn, Rauch, and Jones, also contained the sort of contemporary testimony that becomes increasingly valuable as years go on. Wish some one had found time, years ago, for a brief visit with Patrick Henry.

IF YOU RUN OUT OF SPACE, writes Harold Weiss of Southern Methodist University, be sure to say a few words about Texas. Several important and distinguished schools and regions are not represented at all in this issue, and Shop Talk hopes they report on themselves between now and the August 15 deadline. As for Texas, we are currently interested in the effort of certain Texas millionaires to help get control of the New York Central. Such a success would really be history thrown into reverse: the strange case of the down-country folk who outwitted the city slickers.

OBERLIN COLLEGE has dedicated a new theatre designed by Wallace K. Harrison, chief architect of the United Nations Center in New York. Erected at a cost of $1,200,000, the building was the gift of Charles Martin Hall, an Oberlin graduate who discovered the electrolytic process that made possible the mass production of aluminum. Ohio newspapers have advertised it as "Ohio's most modern public building" and as "the most controversial building in the state." A detailed account of the unique architectural features appeared in the January issue of *Architectural Forum*, and a discussion of the acoustical innovations by Bolt, Beranek and Newman is featured in the January issue of *Institutions*. The auditorium seats 501, and the "wrap-around" stage is eighty feet wide and forty-three feet deep. Initial productions were *St. Joan, Yeoman of the Guard, Of Thee I Sing,* and *Ring Round the Moon*.

A TEACHER TRAINING SERIES, "Speech Improvement in the Classroom," was produced as an educational television demonstration on February 16, by the Speech Division of New Jersey State Teachers College at Montclair. Ted Sheft is program director, L. Howard Fox is program producer, and Lawrence Conrad is program consultant. Among the participants were Ellen Kauffman, Vivian Coon, and Gerald Cantor. The program was over a closed circuit, and was seen by from 75 to 125 administrators at each of three presentations.

THE RIGHT OF THE PUBLIC to visit congressional galleries and to read reports of debates in newspapers is the result of a long struggle that goes back to British parliamentary practice three centuries or so ago. Originally debates were considered to be secret, but over the years newspaper reporters and other visitors managed to gain entrance to parliament, and eventually were allowed to come and go subject only to nominal rules and regulations. On this side of the Atlantic visitors have had a little more freedom, but some restriction of this privilege went into effect on March 2, 1954, the day after the shooting incident, when a rule went into effect requiring every visitor to the Senate or the House of Representatives to have a non-transferable pass signed by a senator or representative.

The new rule recalled to our mind a December afternoon when we made our first visit to the gallery of the House of Commons. Efforts to get a diplomatic pass had met with a conspicuous delay, so we queued up outside the main entrance. An hour passed by, and we were sitting on wooden benches in a narrow hall, the site of St. Stephen's chapel, the eighteenth-century House of Commons. Statues of Burke, Fox, Pitt, Chatham, and others lined the walls. Thirty minutes later we had reached a dignified policeman who asked us to sign an admittance card to what the British call the "Strangers' Gallery." On this card we gave our name and address, promised not to create a disturbance, and in other ways offered assurances of impeccable conduct. We were invited to check parcels and camera, and if we had been carrying a tommy gun, the guard would have courteously taken it into custody.

Inside we had to sit where the man said. We saw better seats over the way and started for them, but were advised they were not available at the moment. We scooched over a railing in order to see better, but were cautioned to stop scooching. Across the aisle a young lady stood momentarily, to survey the scene—a guard requested her to resume her seat. Some one started to munch a sandwich; a flutter among the guards, the munching ceased, the sandwich was tabled.

All of this seemed like very cautious and conservative practice, but by and by a guard said, "You may now move to this other seat—I think you'll find it much better." In another hour the guard whispered, "The House cafeteria is now open; if you would like to go down, we'll save your seat for you." As we started out a guard mumbled, "See that young lady over

there? That's Mr. Churchill's daughter." When we returned, we were invited to sit in a partially-enclosed control booth. By then the number of strangers in the gallery was reduced to a handful. In the booth we had no trouble discussing with three of the guards, in half-whispered fashion, some of the events of the evening.

That is the way visitors are managed in the mother of parliaments. Now that visitors to Congress need to show a pass, no telling how nicely they'll eventually have to behave.

THE STUDENT SPEAKERS' BUREAU is entering its sixteenth year at Michigan State College. Nearly five thousand programs have been presented to more than 450,000 persons in that period of time—a statistic that may be something of a record.

The Bureau offers four types of programs: special interests, foreign students, the readers' section, and the speech department. Under special interests are talks by people who have lived in Alaska, have parachuted from planes to combat forest fires, and who doctor animals, arrange flowers, and stalk deer with bow and arrow. The foreign students come from some thirty or more countries, including the Gold Coast and the Leeward Islands, which are in the Lesser Antilles, if that helps. The readers' section includes "Enoch Arden," "Our Town," and selections from James Thurber, William Shakespeare, and others. The speech department supplies audience-participation debates, discussions, theatrical entertainment, and lectures on parliamentary procedure. David C. Ralph is director and Sharon Robinson assistant director.

THE NATION'S CORPORATIONS, large and small, are doing considerable soul-searching these days because of a shortage of executive talent.

If one can believe half of what he reads, one no longer has to marry the boss's daughter to become a vice-president. The supply of competent sons-in-law is no longer adequate to fill all the top-flight executive jobs. And competition is too keen to fill responsible posts with incompetent relatives: once the sales curve starts down, stockholders start asking too many uncomfortable questions.

What is needed, the trade press says, is merit and competence. And what kind? First of all, the ability to speak and write: not fancifully, but plainly and convincingly. The old smoothie is, in fact, a little mistrusted. Secondly, the kind of training represented by a broad and liberal education. For a while firms seemed to prefer men and women with technical and professional training, but when that source of supply began to dwindle, the companies turned also to history and economics and literature and speech and psychology majors, found they were only a little slower in learning technical details, and had a wealth of other, invaluable attainments and attitudes that carried them farther in the long run. Thirdly, the ability to carry a problem home and study it—like writing a term paper. Fourthly, a capacity for making decisions, visualizing new solutions, inaugurating changes: again, the kind of mental toughness and flexibility that would seem to result from a far-reaching education.

Once in a while a student asks, "What are the opportunities in business for speech majors?" As a start, invite him to read *Fortune*, *Nation's Business*, *Wall Street Journal*, *Business Week*, the finance sections of the Sunday newspapers. The quote from *Fortune* reprinted as a commentary on page 525 of the October, 1952, *QJS*, is worth a careful look. Meanwhile, son, debate tryouts start next week. And next fall you ought to sign up for Contemporary European History, Modern Art, and British and American Oratory.

THE NEW SPEECH AND MUSIC building at the University of Alabama is scheduled to be in use by November, 1954. The building will include a new theatre and clinic facilities, in addition to classrooms and offices. It will have separate wings for the Speech Department and the Music Department, with the center of the building housing the theatre.

TEACHERS OF OTHER SUBJECTS also have problems. Here are notes of a student teacher of French:

> 1st day: Students not doing well in class. Seem to be weak in vocabulary. Informed them that there will be a test over vocabulary tomorrow.
>
> 2nd day: Students did not do well on test. Stressed importance of vocabulary. Must make test easier next time.
>
> 3rd day: Students did not do well on vocabulary drill. Told them there would be vocabulary test tomorrow. Stressed importance of study.
>
> 4th day: Students did poorly on vocabulary test. Worked on vocabulary during class. Assigned another test.
>
> 5th day: Made test easier. Students did better.

FOR YOUR CALENDAR: SAA will meet in Chicago, 1954; in Los Angeles, 1955; in Chicago, 1956; in Boston, 1957; in Chicago, 1958. All of these meetings will be held on the traditional December dates, except the 1957 Boston meeting, scheduled for the last week in August. AETA will meet in 1954 in East Lansing, in late August. ASHA will meet in 1954 in St. Louis, October 25, 26, and 27; Los Angeles, 1955, November 17, 18, and 19; Chicago, 1956, November 19, 20, and 21. A few 1954 spring meetings: CSSA, Chicago, April 2-3; SAA, Dallas, March 29-April 3; SAES, Philadelphia, April 8-10.

SPEECH COMPETENCE, "The Challenge of Our Times" is the theme of the eleventh annual Speech Conference to be held at State University Teachers College, Geneseo, May 7.

The morning session of the conference will include two speakers, a symposium, and a coffee hour. Adrian L. Terlouw, Educational Consultant, Eastman Kodak Company, will talk about "Speech Competence—A Necessity in Today's World."

Mardel Ogilvie, assistant professor of speech, Queens College, will discuss "Speech Improvement and Child Development." Alice S. Austin, assistant professor of speech and dramatic art at Geneseo State, will lead a symposium in theatre arts. Participating in the symposium will be Olla Rickett, instructor, Department of English, State University Teachers College, Cortland; Harold Sliker, dramatics teacher, Monroe High School, Rochester; Georgiana VonTornow, assistant professor of speech, State University Teachers College, Fredonia; and Mary Eva Duthie, executive secretary, New York Community Theaters, Cornell University.

At 2 p.m. a symposium on "Speech Programs in the Public Schools" will be lead by R. Stanley Rutherford, instructor of speech and dramatic art at Geneseo State. Participants in this symposium are Ellis B. Hyde, principal, Dansville Elementary School; Katheryn Kirk, speech consultant and demonstration teacher, Rochester Public Schools; Charlotte Grady Fitzpatrick, director of speech education, Penn Yan; and Robert Wallace, associate in speech correction, State Education Department, Albany.

Following the symposium, John E. Gilmore, supervising-principal, Alfred-Almond Central School, and member of the steering committee of the School of the Air, will talk about "Radio in the Classroom." From 4 to 6 p.m. there will be displays and demonstrations, followed by a buffet supper at 6 p.m. in the college dining room. After supper, Readers' Theatre will be presented under the direction of Miss Austin.

THE NEW TELEVISION station at the University of Missouri, KOMU-TV, was formally dedicated with addresses by Governor Phil M. Donnelly and President Frederick A. Middlebush on January 10.

The station is under the direction of Edward C. Lambert, professor on the faculty of the School of Journalism of the University, whose doctoral dissertation was the first nation-wide study of educational television in the country. Staff from all over the country has been assembled to handle the varied activities of the station. Early in February a new microwave hookup tower was installed, which provides live shows directly from the networks. All four networks, NBC, CBS, ABC, and DuMont, supply shows for the new station.

New courses at both undergraduate and graduate levels are being introduced to meet the needs of students interested in television. Elmer Bladow, associate professor of speech, and Ben Paxton, instructor in speech, are already working actively in this area; additional appointments to the staff are in prospect. Bower Aly, chairman of the Department of Speech and Donovan Rhynsburger, director of dramatics, are, with Dr. Lambert and others, on the television committee.

A series of educational programs broadcast under the title of *Showcase* opened April 7, various departments and divisions of the university contributing. Loren Reid is faculty coordinator of the series; Dorothy Friend, a new staff member of the Department of Speech, formerly with WORD of Spartanburg, South Carolina and KOTV of Tulsa, is producer; and Charles Sigsbee, of the KOMU-TV staff, formerly executive producer of WMAR-TV at Baltimore, is director.

TWO OF THE FINEST full-length recordings of plays yet produced are in the first catalogue of Angel Records, reports William J. Temple. One is a recorded performance of last year's pre-coronation revival in London of *Murder in the Cathedral* with Robert Donat and the Old Vic Company directed by Robert Helpmann. This album preserves the beautifully clear and musical speaking which Brooks Atkinson praised as a chief source of the superiority of this production over its predecessors. The second is *The Importance of Being Earnest*, directed by Sir John Gielgud, with a cast including Sir John, Dame Edith Evans, Pamela

Brown, Jean Cadell, Celia Johnson, and Roland Culver. Both albums deserve the highest recommendation.

Also recommended is MGM's record of *Julius Caesar*, which contains excerpts from the sound track of the film. Bargain-priced Shakespeare is available on two Royale LP's at $1.89. On them members of the Stratford-upon-Avon Festival Company present scenes from *The Tempest* and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*.

Columbia celebrated the fifth anniversary of LP records a few months ago by releasing an album made from the theatrical presentation of *John Brown's Body*, with Charles Laughton directing performances by Tyrone Power, Judith Anderson, and Raymond Massey. Don't miss it. Compare the use of choral voices in this work with the chorus of Canterbury Women in the Angel record of *Murder in the Cathedral*.

Another LP anniversary release was the hundred-dollar set of records called *The Columbia Literary Series*. This prestige-builder includes records of twelve famous English and American authors reading from their own works. The twelve: Maugham, three Sitwells, Saroyan, Steinbeck, Truman Capote, John Collier, Katherine Anne Porter, Edna Ferber, Christopher Isherwood, and Aldous Huxley. The samples sent for review made fascinating listening. Perhaps some time we will be allowed to buy these records separately.

Columbia has also brought out a two-record album called *This I Believe*. One disk contains ten statements from among the hundreds broadcast on Mr. Murrow's radio program. The other contains statements purporting to represent the personal beliefs of ten "immortals" (Socrates to Will Rogers), written by ten other people presumably qualified by study or personal acquaintance, and spoken by ten yet other people. Interesting but not unfailingly inspiring.

THE THERAPY SECTION of the speech department at the University of Alabama has continued experimentation in group therapy with different age levels. Three specific experiments are under way.

The adult clinic, under the direction of Philip Curry, has been held for eight weeks each semester, the patients living on campus in dormitories. They receive individual and group work part of each day.

The children's clinic, under the direction of Mrs. Louise Ward, consists of six-week sessions, each semester, from two to five daily. The parents of the children are encouraged to come and take part in informal classes.

The cerebral palsy clinic, under the guidance of Betty Webster, groups the patients according to type of disability. A clinic for preschool age children is held for those with central-nervous-system injury. These clinics are held for two hours daily for twelve weeks each semester.

VARSITY DEBATERS of the University of Alabama have participated in eight regional and national tournaments so far this year. The squad has debated in Mississippi, Georgia, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Michigan, and Dallas, as well as in Alabama.

Intramural debate is directed by Donald Ecroyd. The primary function of this group this year has been to encourage high school debate throughout the state. It will sponsor the all-state high school tournament at the University in April. The group has traveled to many towns, through the sponsorship of the University Extension service, conducting workshops, discussions and debates, and demonstrations.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Catawba College: *The Little Foxes, Tartuffe, All My Sons, Everyman, Oedipus Rex.*

Johns Hopkins University: *John Ferguson, The Difficult Hour.*

Ohio State University: *The Comedy of Errors, The Cradle Song, The Cocktail Party.*

Oklahoma A. and M.: *I Remember Mama.*

Oregon College of Education: *The Heiress, Mr. Pim Passes By.*

Purdue University: *Bell, Book, and Candle; Anna Christie, The Moon is Blue, Darkness at Noon, The Comedy of Errors.* Michiana summer season: (1953) *Born Yesterday, Bell, Book, and Candle, The Taming of the Shrew, Ladies in Retirement, The Importance of Being Earnest, Years Ago, The Male Animal.*

Queens College: *Ring Round the Moon.*

San Jose State College: *Affairs of Anatol, Volpone, Hansel and Gretel.*

University of Rhode Island: *Street Scene, The Admirable Crichton, The Skin of Our Teeth.*

University of California: Davis Campus: three one-acts, *The Boor, The Long Stay Cut Short, Gone Tomorrow.*

University of Southern California: *The Taming of the Shrew, Electra.*

University of Alabama: *Love from a Stranger, The Drunkard, Brigadoon, The Enchanted, Bamarena.*

University of Pittsburgh: *The Grass Harp.*
Williams College: *Mandragola.*
Yale University: *The Golden Legend of Pansy Doty.*

APPOINTMENTS

Kansas State College: Joyce A. Ryan.

Northeastern State College: Bacon Ingram, Sr., associate professor of speech, coach of debate. Earl W. Blank, professor of speech, chairman of the Department of Speech.

Purdue University: Bedford Thurman, instructor in speech.

University of Missouri: Dorothy Friend, extension instructor in speech.

University of Pittsburgh: Aubrey Epstein, assistant professor of speech; Michael J. McHale, assistant professor of speech; Lloyd Welden, Jr., instructor in speech.

University of Southern California: William Carver, Warren Gasink, Bob Gillen, Peggy Harrison, Eddie Johnson, William Lantz, Marjorie Lumpkin, Milton Shapiro, Maurice Sklar, Edward Thile, Jesse Weaver, assistants in speech.

Yale University: F. Curtis Canfield, chairman of the Department of Drama; Edward Barry Roberts and Eldon Elder, visiting critics for the spring term.

PROMOTIONS

Purdue University: Erling E. Kildahl, assistant professor of speech.

University of Rhode Island: Paul Rohe, assistant professor.

University of Southern California: James Rue, assistant professor of telecommunications.

Queens College: Elizabeth G. Scanlan, assistant professor of speech.

THE NEWLY-ORGANIZED Atlantic Coast Conference, creating an athletic league of Clemson, Duke, Maryland, North Carolina, North Carolina State, South Carolina, Virginia and Wake Forest, has now become a forensic conference as well. The first annual forensic meet of the Atlantic Coast Conference was held at the University of Virginia on February 19 and 20, and centered upon a five-round debate tournament on the national debate topic. Each school entered one affirmative and one negative team and awards were made to team rather than to school entries. Tied for first place in the tournament were the negative teams from Duke, North Carolina, and Wake Forest, and the affirmative from Wake Forest.

Present plans are to continue next year with the debate tournament on the national college topic, and to add an extempore speaker contest, using the national discussion question as a general area, and an after-dinner speaking contest as part of a banquet for all student participants and faculty representatives.

TEACHERS OF SPEECH who struggle with matters of accent and dialect will be glad to know that an organization has been established to give voice to their frustrations. It is the Society for the Preservation of the Anguish Languish; the founder, president, and executive secretary are embodied in the person of Howard L. Chace, of the Department of Romance Languages, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

The Society grew out of the publication of a well-known fable entitled *Ladle Rat Rotten Hut.* This title will no doubt stop the reader dead in his tracks, as it did us when we first saw it in the Merriam-Webster publication, *Word Study*, issue of May, 1953. For those who are intrigued, we will say simply that this is a story about a ladle gull hoe lift wetter murder inner ladle cordage inner lodge, dock, florist. It goes on to portray the whole sordid tale, done to a turn in the neatest Anguish, ending with the proverbial "Mural: Yonder nor sorghum stenches shut ladle gulls stopper torque wet strainers."

In order to become a member of SPAL, you need first of all to read *Ladle Rat Rotten Hut*, and then write Professor Chace a sympathetic and understanding inquiry about it. "People who write the other kind of letter," he writes us, "don't get to be members. Unhappily, our society is so sloppily organized that most of the members don't even know that they belong. Worse yet, from my point of view, nobody ever pays any dues."

Professor Chace offers another stirring bit of Anguish: "Arm jester ditcher offer Rheumatic Languishes hoe ditches Fringe an Spinach an hoe spins moist office term inner clash rum offer lodge universally, gaffing lechers toe gnats-lurking, bought orphan impassioned, bores an gulls." A free-wheeling, idiomatic translation of the above would be: "I'm just a teacher of the Romantic Languages who teaches French and Spanish and who spends most of his time in a class room of a large university giving lectures to nice-looking, but often impatient, boys and girls."

Teachers of speech naturally have much to do with Anguish, and will certainly qualify for membership in the organization. At least so

far as sympathy and understanding are concerned. As for actually paying dues, that's a different sorghum stench.

SHAKESPEARE'S THE COMEDY OF ERRORS was given by the Department of Speech, The Ohio State University, January 29 to February 6. The cast of twenty was under the direction of Reuben Silver, and the setting was designed by Irving Brown and Clyde Blakeley. The play was divided into two parts, allowing for one intermission. The approach to the play was entirely presentational—the cast wore play clothes rather than any sort of period costume. Character was established by such properties as canes and fake beards, derby hats, and symbols of various professions. The acting was on three levels, with actors sometimes playing themselves, sometimes playing the Shakespearean character and sometimes playing themselves playing the character. However, the break with traditional interpretation was only in business and movement; the Shakespearean lines were not altered and none were added.

EVER SINCE THE *Poetics* students of drama have discussed the relative importance of the theatre's various constituents. In an exclusive interview appearing in the March 5 issue of *United States News and World Report*, Sam Goldwyn, 69-year-old veteran of picture making, speaks words of cheer that will be seized upon by students in playwriting classes.

Early in the interview is this exchange (we quote by permission of the magazine's editor):

> *Q.* What is ahead? Will movie stars still be matinee and bobby-sox idols? *A.* . . . The foundation for this business is the story, and if the story is good you have the start towards a good picture. It is the story that makes the star. . . .

A little later on this information appears:

> *Q.* [Doesn't] CinemaScope attract [moviegoers]? *A.* CinemaScope has had a great attraction . . . but my personal opinion is that a bad story will be twice as bad on a big screen. . . . *Q.* Are stars any longer necessary . . . ? *A.* A star cannot put over a bad story. *Q.* A good story can put over a poor star? *A.* A good story can make a star.

And at the end of the interview Mr. Goldwyn is asked:

> *Q.* What is the biggest problem facing the industry today? *A.* The biggest problem? To get great stories . . .

Courses in playwriting are an important part of drama and the theatre. Mr. Goldwyn's testimony indicates that students will find a market for anything good they happen to turn out.

A HANDY ITEM for a scholar's desk is the new *Index* to all publications of the Speech Association of America. The office at Iowa City brought it out last summer, making it a complete reference to all articles in *QJS*, *Speech Monographs*, and *The Speech Teacher*, from Volume I of each publication through all 1952 issues. Its contents are so arranged that any one can quickly tell what articles on a given subject have appeared in these publications. It is available at a nominal price—since you asked, a dollar a copy—and ought to be in the hands of every one starting a term report, searching out a dissertation topic, or preparing a list of references.

ADELPHI COLLEGE plans a six-weeks' workshop in speech and hearing therapy from July 8 to August 13. The purpose is to study learning theory and disorders of speech and methods of clinical practice. Lectures will be offered by visiting specialists in psychoanalysis, medicine, psychology, and speech pathology. Students in attendance will conduct individual projects. Franklyn Elliott is the director of the Speech and Hearing Center at Adelphi.

WE WOULD LIKE TO LOCATE some of the ardent book collectors of our profession and print a note now and then about their activities and achievements. Every one collects books, after a fashion, if it is only to save textbooks and desk copies; but there is an excellent future for small, choice libraries built around one or more of the many specialties in our fields. Any university would be glad to have, for example, a first-rate collection of books, reprints, pamphlets, and other documents in a field like speech pathology, or theatre history, or interpretation, or any specialty you care to name.

Our scouts who buy and sell books say that a good collector can realize a small margin on his investment, if he uses reasonable care in making his purchases. Many good items can be secured at no cost at all, or at small cost. Others seem expensive now, but will be worth more later. Chauncey A. Goodrich's *Select British Eloquence*, for example, could once be found for two or three dollars, bound in red calf with titles in gold leaf. The last quotation we saw,

and that was five years ago, was fifteen dollars for a run-of-the-mill binding.

Book collectors, like antiquers, are fond of talking about their finds, like the librarian who attempted to amass, for his private collection, a copy of every edition of *The Compleat Angler* ever printed, and in one of them found a letter by Isaak Walton himself. Only luck we ever had was to locate an Italian edition of *Della Retorica d'Aristotele*, dated 1572 and priced at only a few shillings. On the inside front cover was a bookplate from Holland House, a fox displayed prominently on the coat of arms, suggesting that the great orator himself might have purchased the book while traveling through Italy. The translation, by Alessandro Piccolomini, appeared to a colleague in Romance Languages to follow the usual Greek text though there were one or two brief interpolations.

English booksellers that have a large supply of titles in classical and medieval rhetoric, history, biography, and the like, are George Harding's Bookshop, 106 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1, and B. H. Blackwell, Ltd., 48-51 Broad Street, Oxford, England. Both issue frequent printed lists and seem pleased to include American purchasers on their mailings. We have also picked up a few titles from W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., Petty Cury, Cambridge, England, and D. A. Berry, 141 Westmount Road, Eltham Park, London, S.E. 9. Other addresses may be found in most London Sunday newspapers. American titles, of course, are best located from firms in this country.

If anyone reads this, starts a big collection, and ends by giving it to a library instead of making a fortune in commercial channels, let him forget where he found the suggestion.

THE GRADUATE RECORD TEST in speech is worth mentioning again. It is a three-hour examination aimed at providing a comprehensive achievement score in speech at the level of the graduating senior who has majored in speech. Items cover a wide variety of areas and are set up to test for information and judgment. Institutions carrying on graduate study in speech may want to use this test in their programs. Educational Testing Service, 20 Nassau Street, Princeton, can supply additional information.

PLANS TO ERECT a new theatre on the Purdue campus are in an advanced stage. Construction is scheduled to begin late this spring or early in the summer. The most modern ideas in theatre construction will be incorporated into this structure. Planned to accommodate an audience of 1000 in its main auditorium, it will be completed by 1957. Two floors below the main auditorium will be located a subsidiary theatre, designed for flexibility as theatre-in-the-round, proscenium or area staging.

FOR THE THIRD consecutive summer Purdue University will sponsor, in cooperation with the Dunes Arts Foundation, a workshop for teachers in creative art and dramatics, on the grounds of the Foundation near Michigan City, Indiana. The short courses in production, directing, acting, ceramics, creative dramatics, and painting will be offered from June 28 to July 17. A summer stock season of eight plays will be staged from June 23 to Aug. 30.

SPEECH WEEK at the University of Pittsburgh, March 16 to 23, featured a variety of events. A poetry reading festival, with Ruth R. Hahn as chairman, opened the week Tuesday afternoon, March 16. Wednesday afternoon Pittsburgh debaters clashed with Princeton University on the national collegiate question. Thursday afternoon was reserved for a play clinic, with talks by Harvey J. Pope, Lloyd W. Welden, Jr., Michael McHale, Barbara McIntyre, and Kenneth Edgar, followed by a tour of the plant, and later by a tour of WOED-TV studios. On Thursday evening Pitt Players presented *The Grass Harp*, by Truman Capote, the play being repeated on two other occasions during the week. Finals of an extemporaneous speaking contest were held on Friday afternoon, and an oratorical contest was scheduled for the following Monday. A speech assembly, with Arthur Larson, Dean of the School of Law, as guest speaker, and with distinguished guests in attendance, completed the week's program.

BUD ROBINSON was a nineteenth-century backwoods preacher of the southwest, who, according to a highly-readable article by Mallalieu Wilson of Northwest Nazarene College, in an issue of *Western Speech*, March, 1952, traveled two million miles, preached more than 38,000 times, and made more than a hundred thousand converts. The article is well worth reading for the picture it gives of a speaker who developed the liveliest pulpit style that side of the Mississippi. Professor Wilson opens his article with a typical prayer of this frontier preacher: "O Lord, give me a backbone as big as a sawlog and ribs like the sleepers under the church floor; put iron shoes on me and galvanized breeches and hang a wagon load of determination up in the gable-end of my soul and help me to sign the con-

tract to fight the devil as long as I have a fist, and bite him as long as I have a tooth, and then gum him till I die."

Tack this on your wall to read at the end of a long, hard day of devil-fighting.

THIS APRIL ISSUE of the *QJS* certainly follows hard on the heels of the February number. We feel that we must have contributors stranded all over the continent, with not nearly enough time to get their dispatches into the mail. In fact, the note in the February Shop Talk said that the deadline for the April issue was February 15; so any prospective contributor who did not pick up his *Journal* until February 16 or thereafter must have felt he was licked before he got started.

This item is to say that the deadline for the October issue is a long ways off, to wit August 15, and we would really like to break out at the seams. Your new appointments and promotions are important milestones that should be recorded, along with your news about buildings, activities, and the Good Old Curriculum. Brief notes and comments of other sorts are also cordially invited. A hundred thank-you's to numerous contributors who helped with this issue and who thus kept the Vulture at a good and respectful distance.

PERSONAL NOTES

Paul H. Boase and Robert G. Gunderson of Oberlin College have been granted leaves of absence in alternate semesters of the academic year 1954-1955. Mr. Boase will do research toward a volume on "The Methodist Circuit Rider on the Frontier," and Mr. Gunderson hopes to complete his study of "The Washington Peace Conference of 1861."

Mrs. Courtaney Brooks of San Jose State College is touring the state colleges of California, gathering material for her doctorate in speech at Stanford University. . . . James Clancy has been appointed Assistant Editor for the *Educational Theatre Journal* and assumes his duties immediately. Hugh Gillis is associate editor of the same publication.

During the fall semester, the Speech Department of the University of Southern California had as a teacher, Joe Flynn, star of "The Flynn Show" on television. In the Drama Department, Lurene Tuttle, star of stage, screen, radio, and television taught a course. Miss Tuttle can be currently seen in *Life With Father*. . . . J. T. (Tex) Daniels, formerly of the University of Alabama and Geneseo State Teacher's College, is now coaching Occidental debate teams during the spring semester while Norman Freestone is on sabbatical leave. Mr. Daniels is simultaneously pursuing his Ph.D. studies at U.S.C. . . . Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, partly narrated in middle English, will be introduced for the first time to high school students in a film produced by Maynard Smith of the Cinema Department. . . . Milton Dickens, head of the Department of Speech, has concluded work on the proofs of his book, *Speech: The Dynamics of Communication*, to be published by Harcourt Brace about April. . . . W. Charles Redding is editor and one of the authors of a forthcoming symposium on debate. . . . Lee Edward Travis worked on a symposium in speech correction during his sabbatical leave in the fall semester. . . . Victor Garwood and W. F. Carver were seen on an NBC television program. Dr. Garwood talked on the problems of hearing, and Mr. Carver demonstrated the use of hearing testing equipment and methods. . . . Charles F. Lindsley, head of the Department of Speech at Occidental College, gave a lecture-recital to the Faculty Club of the University of Southern California . . . . Hans Rotha, outstanding authority on Max Reinhart and former associate of Reinhart, gave a lecture on scenic design at the Stop Gap Theatre.

Joseph G. Stockdale, Jr., of Purdue University, is on leave attending the University of Denver.

John H. Green has returned to Oklahoma A. and M. College after a sabbatical leave of absence during which he continued his graduate study at the University of Denver.

Max E. Fuller, formerly professor of speech at Grinnell College and later dean of the College, is now director of field education for the Maytag Company of Newton, Iowa.

Paul R. Beall resigned from Penn State last summer and is now a consultant on management and communication problems. One of his assignments is with the Air Research and Development Command in Baltimore. In addition he spends about half-time as private consultant to industry.

Gail Boardman, professor of English and Speech at Indiana State Teachers College, has received the award of The Mark Twain International Society for her text in interpretation, *Oral Communication of Literature*. Plans are now under way between Prentice-Hall and the Library of Congress to have the book also published in Braille. Dr. Boardman served as critic for the Choral Speaking Festival in